

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

DECEMBER 18, 1937

WHO'S WHO

GAULT MACGOWAN, special staff writer for the New York *Sun*, was given special mention in this column, issue of October 23. He is no more Fascist than he is Communist; though a non-Catholic, he does not temporize on the Communist issue as do so many Protestant and Jewish leaders. A friend notes: "Macgowan feels very deeply on this subject and writes straight out of his heart." . . . E. L. CHICANOT, though an old-time contributor, has not recently appeared in our pages. He is English by birth and education, though resident in Canada since 1910, barring the years of service in the World War. Before devoting himself to newspaper work, he spent much time among the homesteaders and foreign colonies in Western Canada. Living in Montreal, he wrote extensively on immigration and colonization projects. At present, he is the managing editor of a medical-economics magazine. . . . LAURENCE KENT PATTERSON, senior professor of history on the faculty of Woodstock College, Maryland, is no less an authority on international government of the present day than on autocratic governments of the eighteenth-century period.

NEXT WEEK, the issue will be dated on Christmas morning. On the cover will be a virile, modern woodcut by John J. A. Murphy. On the title page will be a homily on the shepherds, composed before 1400, and rendered in exquisite style by John Boon. Within, William J. Benn will have a Nativity meditation; Father Feeney will offer a selection of poems for the Saviour; and Michael Burt, whom we cannot identify, will submit a series of perplexing communications. May the issue bring human cheer and Divine love!

THIS WEEK

COMMENT	242
GENERAL ARTICLES	
Fascism Is the Target for Communist Artillery Gault Macgowan	244
Rebecca of Honeybrook Farm... Paul L. Blakely	245
Workers of Quebec Unionize on Catholic Plan E. L. Chicanot	247
Salazar, the Inspirer of Portugal's New State Laurence K. Patterson	249
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF.... John LaFarge	251
EDITORIALS	252
Picketing ... To the Left ... To the Right ... Courts and Schools in Germany ... The Masked Enemy ... Pull Together! ... Salvation of God.	
CHRONICLE	255
CORRESPONDENCE	257
LITERATURE AND ARTS	
Premature Report Starts Some Catholic Press History	258
POETRY	260
St. John of the Cross..... J. Corson Miller	
To a Poet Long Silent..... Ludger Wuenschel	
Two Sonnets..... Felix Doherty	
Child Wonderful..... Robert O'Connell	
Ambassadorial Address..... David Gordon	
BOOKS	261
Augustus, The Golden Age of Rome Carol L. Bernhardt	
Recent Theories of Sovereignty Herbert C. Noonan	
What Man Has Made of Man..... Mark Gaffney	
THEATRE..... Elizabeth Jordan	262
ART..... Harry Lorin Blinsse	263
FILMS..... Thomas J. Fitzmorris	264
EVENTS..... The Parader	264

Editor-in-Chief: FRANCIS X. TALBOT.

Associate Editors: PAUL L. BLAKELY, JOHN LAFARGE, GERARD DONNELLY,
JOHN A. TOOMBEY, LEONARD FEENEY, WILLIAM J. BENN, ALBERT I. WHELAN.

Editorial Office: 329 W. 108TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY.

Business Manager: FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE.

Business Office: 53 PARK PLACE, NEW YORK CITY.

AMERICA. Published weekly by The America Press, 53 Park Place, New York, N. Y., December 18, 1937, Vol. LVIII, No. 11, Whole No. 1471. Telephone BARclay 7-8993. Cable Address: Cathreview. United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly \$4.00; Canada, \$4.50; Europe, \$5.00. Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, under Act of March 3, 1879. AMERICA, A Catholic Review of the Week, U. S. Pat. Off.

COMMENT

ONE of the best means of making a whole people conscious of a vital issue is to write a song about the matter and get the whole people singing it. War issues are usually treated in this fashion and with obvious success as far as the objective is concerned. Now, George M. Cohan in his current theatrical success, *I'd Rather Be Right*, has a song that fits the critical question of bringing the national budget into balance. The title of the song is *We're Going to Balance the Budget*. There is a swing to the tune, a catchiness to the words, and a pack of truth behind it that needs to be impressed on the minds of the people, so that they in turn can bring pressure to bear on the political groups whose influence is determining the fiscal policies of the Government. The budget problem has become increasingly ominous when seven successive deficits have more than doubled our national indebtedness. The Administration in Washington is thoroughly conscious of the danger that threatens the country from this prolonged spree of spending, but it cannot bring about the reform without the effective cooperation of public opinion. It can, of course, start the ball a'rolling by such measures as encouragement of local independence and self-reliance, restoration of power and the assumption of responsibility on the part of cities and States. But above all, the arousal of public consciousness to the dangers of continued spending will be the most effective way of calling a halt. So let us all join in and sing *We're Going to Balance the Budget* and perhaps we shall get the support necessary to make it a fact.

- - -

ATTENTION was rightly directed recently to our common national failure to appraise correctly our national well-being and security. The speaker, Aubrey Williams, director of the National Youth Administration, thought the press tended to give a roseate, lopsided view of our economic situation in stressing the pick-up in employment, without also emphasizing the spread of our national income and the astonishing inequality that still exists among the families of the unemployed. With farmers in certain sections of the South having a family budget of \$180 a year, with 36,000 American families having total incomes that equal the incomes of 10,000,000 families at the bottom of the heap, he would be a hardy optimist that could look with pleasure on such a situation. Urging Americans to face the music by facing the facts and not sticking their heads in the sands, he regretted that the press in its efforts to reassure the public did not give a truer picture of the case. It can hardly be doubted that we do fool ourselves and like to be fooled into thinking ourselves secure by quoting the annual income, the great natural wealth of the country and the

market returns. It is, perhaps, too much to expect our big city papers to be as keen on the state and stability of our farmers and their labor help as on Wall Street and bank balances. Yet it is the long and wide vision that gauges correctly the national security pulse. It was at a time of a great gulf between the high and low bracket incomes that we were reassured by one who should know, and did not, that there was a car in every garage and a chicken in every pot.

- - -

WILFUL destruction of defenseless hospitals does not accord with what we know about the humanitarianism of Generalissimo Franco. Naturally, when a press correspondent for a reputable New York newspaper reports that two hospitals at Tarancon were "razed by Rebel bombing," our instinct is to inquire further into the supposed outrage. Reliable press representatives inform us emphatically that it is true that on several occasions air raids have been made on vicinities close to hospitals behind the Red lines, but invariably the reason for the raid has been the fact that artillery emplacements or munition deposits had been established there by the Reds. We have read time and again of the bombing of Madrid's telephone exchange, but the same correspondents likewise inform us that the building was left unmolested until the Reds employed the tower as an artillery observation point. But correspondents in Red Spain write only what the bureau of propaganda authorizes. However, the New York Times correspondent, relying solely on official news releases while several hundred miles away, does give us an inkling of the truth in his report of the attack on the hospitals at Tarancon. He particularly calls our attention to the fact that no casualties occurred among patients, doctors or nurses. Forewarned of the raid by a reconnaissance plane, the hospital was quickly evacuated. We are surely permitted to read between the lines of the dispatch and reflect how it could possibly happen that a hospital could be evacuated of all its patients in the matter of the few minutes between the sighting of the bombers and the pulling of the triggers that released the bombs. It does look as though that line was put over on the censors.

- - -

COINCIDENT with our *Comment* of last week, stating that the only obstacle preventing Father Coughlin from returning to his broadcasts was Father Coughlin's own decision, came the announcement in the public press that the Radio Priest would again resume his air addresses. The announcement was accompanied with a statement by Archbishop Mooney to the effect that the resumption of the broadcasts "represents an exercise

of the liberty of action which he (Father Coughlin) has always enjoyed in this matter." The only restrictions that an ecclesiastical superior places upon the pulpit or the public orator are those of truth and prudence. The truth involves the soundness of the doctrine taught in theology and philosophy and morality, and the saneness of the theories advanced in regard to economics, social problems and the questions of the day. The prudence is that of the priest speaking with the charity of Christ, yet, when the occasion demands, raising his voice with the vehemence of an aroused Christ. But the occasion for denunciation should be equal to that which brought forth from the Sacred Lips the soul-searing condemnation of those who profaned sacred places and made of God a mockery. Father Coughlin has pronounced truth prudently in his Sunday broadcasts and in his future broadcasts will, according to Archbishop Mooney's hope, "bring to bear on a nation-wide audience his recognized power for good as an exponent of Catholic teaching."

- - -

SCATHING denunciation of Church Minister Hanns Kerrl's assertions that the Nazi regime was not attacking Christianity was fearlessly read from the pulpits by order of Berlin's Bishop, Count Konrad von Preysing on Sunday, December 5. The condemnation of the Government's attitude toward religion was in the form of a joint pastoral letter of the German Bishops. Innumerable examples of repression were cited. Twelve printing establishments that had dared to publish the recent Papal Encyclical were expropriated; Catholic young men's organizations were dissolved; a number of Catholic periodicals have been indefinitely banned; the Bishop's own house was raided and 60,000 copies of the recent Papal Encyclical on the Rosary were confiscated; confessional schools have been forcibly done away with; every manner of picture, caricature and propaganda circular has been employed to minimize and ridicule religious belief; every defense against the flood of propaganda exploiting the immorality trials has been prevented; and, above all, as the pastoral proclaims, the attempt to desecrate the temple of children's souls, consecrated by Baptism, through enforced secularized, anti-Christian education. The concluding words of the pastoral are worthy of note. "We Bishops do not want a battle, but we should be cowards and hirelings if we should betray the Faith with such a peace as is offered us."

- - -

DR. COHALAN, Bishop of Cork, Ireland, struck a new note that must have somewhat nonplussed his hearers in a lecture on the Catholic Church. The inspiration of his lecture was a communication published in the *Church of Ireland Gazette* under the heading *Rome and Ourselves: The Things that Divide*. The writer of the article disclaimed all intention of controversy. "It is not a time for controversy amongst Christians. The enemies of Our Lord are organized and active in so many places, while the divisions among Christians are seriously

injuring the Christian cause and weakening the Christian defense." The Bishop, taking this cue, delivered what may be called a model apologetic lecture on the Catholic Church showing its agreement, where real, but also pointing out the very real differences that existed between it and Protestantism. "I propose then, not in a spirit of controversy, but to remove misconception and misunderstanding, to speak of the Catholic Church as known to us, who are within, and as often misrepresented, and on that account misjudged by those who are without." Toward the end of his lecture, the Bishop said there was a longing in the Christian world for universal Christian union. There is so much evil in the world, and the powers of darkness are so active, that many are sighing and praying for united Christian action. But unity of action, to be far-reaching, is impossible without unity of Faith. Then the Bishop made his novel suggestion. Referring to the happy relations between Catholics and Protestants in Cork, where both parties have to work together for the good of the city and state, where old differences cannot be forgotten in a moment, he declared about Protestants: "They have a most worthy and venerated Bishop, respected by all. Let him only come to terms for himself and his flock with the Pope, and it can easily be arranged that he shall be the Catholic Bishop for his own people in St. Finbarr's, while I continue the Catholic Bishop in St. Mary's."

- - -

THERE have been "only two just doctrines in Occidental philosophy," announced on December 1 Hanns Kerrl, Germany's Minister for Church Affairs in the process of accusing 8,000 Catholic priests and Religious of crimes. The proponents of these two just doctrines were Plato and Kant. That America has her democratic government today, and has not gone the way of nations which follow Kant, is due, according to the Rev. William F. Obering, S.J., who writes in *Thought* for December, 1937, to the philosophy of James Wilson, principal thinker of the framers of American Constitution. Those of us who imagine that scholastic philosophy is a sort of sacerdotal technique, locked up in seminary libraries for the unique purposes of theology, will be completely disabused if they study Dr. Obering's article, and discover how profoundly James Wilson was indebted to Aquinas and the entire tradition of the schools first, for his metaphysics, upon which he based his ethical system, and then for his concept of the natural law and its relation to government. For Wilson the juridical order, contrary to the "just" Kant who knew no objective foundation for justice, was "a province of the more comprehensive moral order and subject to its supreme control." Only a shallow scholarship, says Dr. Obering, can identify the American political philosophy with that of Grotius, Locke and Rousseau. The same thesis is proved, under other aspects in the same issue of *Thought*, by Dr. J. Moss Ives, a non-Catholic scholar and jurist, while Paul L. Blakely analyzes, in the light of recent decisions and legislation, the Constitution and Industrial Reform.

FASCISM IS THE TARGET FOR COMMUNIST ARTILLERY

The bourgeoisie are the masses for Red recruiting

GAULT MACGOWAN

"HE'S A FASCIST. CUT HIS THROAT." The first time I heard it was from the lips of a Spanish laborer working in the fields outside Barcelona. He accompanied it by drawing one finger across his throat and spitting. With variations, I have heard the same sentiment since then expressed in widely differing zones from Europe to the Americas. Whenever I see War and Fascism hyphenated, I hyphenate mentally Communism and Murder. Why does not someone start a society to oppose that? *He's a Fascist, cut his throat* is the new slogan of international Bolshevism. I wonder if the benevolent old ladies and humanitarian old gentlemen who flock to meetings against War-and-Fascism realize it.

Fascists today are bourgeois who refuse to be killed quietly. They have had the impertinence to resist liquidation at the hands of Red revolutionists. Their organization in self-defense has been a god-send to orthodox Communists. As long as the bourgeois were their only target the Left-wingers were making comparatively little progress. But since Mussolini broke with Bolshevik socialism and created the corporate state, Fascism has become the whipping-boy of Moscow. It has served to distract attention from the undercover campaign on organized society. Even the good bourgeois of Republican France and of the respectable English middle-class, who were once scared by Communism's declared war upon them, have been mollified by Moscow's apparent switch of hate to Fascism and have made common cause against it.

Fascism is but bourgeoisie writ large. You will not find Fascist mentioned in any of the orthodox Communist textbooks as interchangeable with bourgeois. Karl Marx, Lenin and the older Bolsheviks died before Fascism was invented. Twenty years ago the bourgeois offered the readiest means that Russian revolutionists could find to upset international contentment. But the march of time has produced a new state of affairs. Education has made it increasingly difficult to distinguish readily between the proletariat and the bourgeois.

The masses, in fact, were the first to resent the term proletariat. Ever since that word became current they have been doing their best to become absorbed into the ranks of the bourgeois. The whole trend of social legislation has been helping them to

do it. The growth of democracy and the increase of taxation of the wealthy has done more to level out social inequalities than twenty years of Red propaganda. Communists have begun to learn that it does not pay to alienate the bourgeoisie. In the first place, they have recruited some of their best men from its ranks. Communism cannot flourish without financial support, and bourgeois contributions can be counted in dollars instead of dimes. Where would the movement be today in America, if it were not for the army of parlor-pinks and bourgeois intellectuals and writers? The proletariat do not pen the articles attacking Mussolini.

Fascism hopped into the picture just in time to save Communism for posterity. From a purely Italian origin, it has now been twisted into meaning Nazi, Brazilian, Monarchist, Economic Royalist, Catholic, Confucian, you, me and everyone else who is not a Communist. But you are not to know that, bless you. You are asked just to hate Fascism and to forget that it is a substitute target for yourself. But if you should be so unwise as to protest against Red tactics you will find out soon enough where you belong. You will surely be called a Fascist immediately.

In a New York school the other day, pupils were told that Italy, Germany, Portugal, Japan, Turkey, Persia and Brazil were all Fascist countries. It was arrant nonsense, of course. Italy alone is Fascist. Each of the other countries mentioned has a form of government adapted to its own requirements. Hitler's party, for instance, is The National Socialist German Workers Party, with the abolition of unearned increment as one of its planks. But Communist writers would lead us to suppose that it is a party organized and promoted to protect vested interests.

From November 9 to November 14, they got away with the thesis that Brazil had become a Fascist country. Headlines in all the newspapers proclaimed it. However, on November 14, President Vargas cabled to the New York Times to point out that his new constitution was not Fascist but merely a logical movement against Communist tactics. In the interests of good neighborliness, it might have been expected that this correction of a misapprehension would have been given space on the

front page. But as the Vargas cable was tucked away inside, it would seem courteous to drag it forth into the light of day.

In order to make Fascism appear as wicked as possible, it must be made to appear as strong as possible. If that is done, people will forget that Communism is war and grew out of war and revolution; that the real menace is Communism, and not Fascism.

The very name *Popular Front* which is associated with the Left is indicative of the battle-line. The designation *Comrade* applied to a party member is a word taken directly from the soldier's vocabulary. Party discipline, the party salute, Councils of Soldiers and Sailors, all these have a familiar militarist ring. Until the Reds came along with their clenched fist no other political party found it necessary to invent a special salute. Soldiers, of course, have to have an enemy, present or potential, to inspire their martial ardor. The bourgeois were all right to begin with but they had one disadvantage. They would not play soldier. The democratic nations refused to take the idea of mass massacre seriously. They committed the unforgivable sin of kidding the Communists.

So it was a day of rejoicing in international Communist camps when Mussolini organized Italy on semi-military lines. It meant that Communism was now to be taken seriously. The Reds had an immediate access of recruits from the bourgeois and were swift to see the advantage they gained at the polls by inflaming the bourgeoisie of other countries against the organized bourgeoisie of Italy. When Germany followed suit with a united front against the Comintern, it seemed just too good to be true. Nothing could give more heart to international Communism than the discovery that, while they could not make a popular international front against the bourgeoisie under that name, they could call it Fascism and under that hated title get away with it.

Mussolini, unwittingly, cast himself in the role of Santa Claus for the Comintern. Every extravagance of his regime was a gift for the Bolshevik stocking. While no one has produced a popular and easily remembered caricature of Stalin, the lines of Mussolini's scowling face have been made known all over the world. Every act of his, every act of his deputies, has been put under the microscope. And the object of all the anti-Mussolini propaganda has been to set up a smoke-screen for Red terrorism. Scarcely anyone remembers now that had it not been for the example of practical Communism in Italy, Fascism might never have been born. Had it not been for Communism, Hitler would never have had his chance, Franco would never have arisen in Spain, and the Japs would have had no excuse to invade China.

But forgetting all this we are asked to crusade against War and Fascism. Yet Moscow's luck holds. Most of us do forget it. Human memory is mercilessly short. The real truth of the situation might burn itself into our brains were we to keep abreast of current Communist speechmaking. From many platforms just now there is a marked tendency to

describe Russia as a country devoted to democracy and peace.

"We know that that great pacific power, the Soviet Union, wants peace," declared Earl Browder, the leader of Communism in the United States in a speech at the Coney Island Velodrome on September 2. He appears to have overlooked a letter he read at the same meeting. It was from the "President of the Chinese Soviet Republic," so Browder said. It read in part as follows:

From several American friends, and from other sources, we learned that the Communist Party of the United States and the masses of the American people are deeply concerned with China's struggle against Japan and have given us assistance in many ways. This makes us feel that when we achieve victory, this victory will be of considerable help to the struggle of the American people for liberation. The world is now on the eve of a great explosion. The working class of the world and all the peoples who desire liberation must unite for the common struggle.

Revolutionary greetings

Mao Tse-tung

Only a slight rent in the sheepskin maybe; but it exposes the wolf. Our sympathy is being enlisted against War and Fascism to make the world safe for Communism and Revolution. Is it any wonder, therefore, that those who know the inside story of the Nationalist revolt in Spain, fear lest a victory there for Moscow may cause mischief and massacre to leap the seas?

REBECCA OF HONEYBROOK FARM

PAUL L. BLAKELY



SQUARING himself, the learned attorney for the Commonwealth addressed the witness in cross-examination.

"How many justices are there," he asked in an austere tone, "on the bench of the Supreme Court?"

The witness is a little Amish girl, Rebecca King, of Honeybrook, Pennsylvania, and she is just fourteen years old. I should like to know what Rebecca would have answered, but she was interrupted—or the attorney was. "Better put that question to the school board," said His Honor. "There seems to be some doubt about the matter."

Foiled in his fiendish plot, the attorney proposed a problem which, to me, seems to lie in the realms of the higher mathematics.

"If I sold a horse for \$230 and gained a profit of fifteen per cent," he dictated, "how much did I make?"

Here Rebecca, even as you and I, requested paper and a pencil. After a few moments consumed, partly, in biting the pencil (she should have bitten the attorney) she announced: "\$245 and no cents."

After consulting with counsel on both sides, the Court announced that this was wrong. Rebecca went to work again, and after five minutes handed

the results to the Jeffreys on the bench. His Honor fumbled pathetically with the paper, and after further consultation, announced: "No, you didn't get that one." I hope the records of this case are impounded. We want to know the results reached by the Court.

If you are wondering what this is all about, and why Rebecca King at the age of fourteen is forced to undergo a public examination in the Federal District Court at Philadelphia, let me remark that this was a case arising under Pennsylvania's compulsory-school law.

Rebecca's father, Aaron King, a Honeybrook farmer, is a member of an Amish congregation. He thinks his daughter knows all that any girl ought to know. The school authorities disagreed. Aaron was haled into a local court, and fined two dollars. On his refusal to pay, he was sent to jail, and after a night in a cell, somehow obtained an appeal to the Federal District Court. The county authorities pleaded that since the case was purely local the Federal court was without jurisdiction. Federal Judge Welsh expressed some doubts as to his competency, and took the case under advisement.

Putting this knotty point aside, let us pick Rebecca's brains, and find out what she knows. Making a comparison, you may also discover how much you don't know.

Rebecca knows who "discovered electricity" (so reports the esteemed Associated Press), who invented the cotton-gin, the harvester, the steam engine, and the radio. Under a barrage of questions, she stood up gamely. She knew the price of corn, wheat, pork and other farm products. The greatest book in the world is the Bible, and the three greatest Presidents were Washington, Jefferson and Lincoln. From the depths of her poke bonnet (I wish I could have seen her!) she defended various propositions in history, geography, science and arithmetic. Under the guidance of counsel, she informed the Federal District Court that she could bake, raise turkeys and make cider.

Whatever you may feel about it, personally I should not care for a similar examination. All I should reap would be a collection of "D's." But do you think the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is justified in obliging Rebecca to continue her education? Does she not know enough to fit her for her duties in life, and to keep herself from becoming a menace to good order in the Commonwealth?

It has long been established that the several States, and school districts acting under delegated authority, may oblige all children to attend school. The reason is obvious: a certain degree of education is necessary for all in the modern State. Further, the civil authority may fix the length of the school year, the subjects to be studied, the qualifications of teachers and administrators, and the age up to which the child must attend school. The underlying principle is that the State must adopt due measures for its own security and preservation, and one of these measures is to insure to all the training which is necessary to fit them to perform the duties of citizenship acceptably.

But it has also been held that the State may not

act arbitrarily. The means which it adopts must have a direct relation to reality. The wishes of parents, the ability of the children, their health, and a dozen other factors must be considered. The Supreme Court of the United States has held that a State could not forbid the teaching of German in a private school on the ground that an acquaintance with the language of Goethe would tend to make them disloyal citizens. Nor may a State compel parents to entrust their children to a public school on the theory, now dominant in Nazi Germany, that only a State school can possibly give the child the training which it needs. Speaking generally, the courts have held that in all these matters a large degree of discretion is permitted, but common-sense, certainly, must control the actions of the school authorities.

This right of the State to make reasonable regulations for the education of every child is not denied by the Church. On the contrary, it is defended by the Church. As Pius XI, repeating Leo XIII, wrote in the Encyclical *On the Christian Education of Youth* the education of the child belongs to parents, the Church and the State, "though in different ways." After outlining the duty of the State to encourage and supplement the work of parents and the Church, Pius XI writes:

For the State more than any other society is provided with the means put at its disposal for the needs of all, and it is only right that it use these means to the advantage of those who have contributed them. Over and above this, the State can exact, and take measures to secure, that all its citizens have the necessary knowledge of their civic and political duties, and a certain degree of physical, intellectual and moral culture, which, considering the conditions of our times, is really necessary for the common good.

Hence, while the duty and the right to educate the child pertains primarily to parents, it is not correct to say that the State is wholly excluded from education. It not only may, but must, supply when the parents of the child fail to care for its proper training. This does not mean that the State may intrude at will into the family, making rules and regulations which really supersede parental authority. The role of the State is, properly, to encourage and to assist in the duty that belongs fundamentally to the parents.

All this is clear, as a theory. Meanwhile Rebecca is waiting for a decision. Must she go to school or may she with a clear conscience raise turkeys and make cider?

That she knows enough to fit her for her duties in life is abundantly plain. Were that the controlling principle, she might be discharged. Unfortunately *de minimis non curat lex*, which means that the law does not take cognizance of little Rebeccas. But is the law itself reasonable? It is not, in my judgment, as far as it applies to this case. But it may be competently argued that while the law may work hardship in an individual case, its enforcement is necessary wherever it is definitely required for the common good.

I'm afraid Rebecca must set aside her spare moments for the turkeys and the cider. What do you think?

WORKERS OF QUEBEC UNIONIZE ON CATHOLIC PLAN

A unique development in accord with the Encyclicals

E. L. CHICANOT

THE National Catholic Unions of Quebec (*Syndicats Catholiques Nationaux*) virtually for the first time have been in the headlines of the newspapers as they fought to a successful conclusion in the biggest industrial dispute the Province has known. People have been wondering and are inquiring about them, and with good reason. For the achievement of their objective, after calling and conducting a strike which involved the major textile plants of Quebec with thousands of workers, has revealed this organization as a factor of prime importance in the labor affairs of the French Canadian Province and of yet greater potentiality the extent of which can only be surmised.

Up to recent times not a great deal of attention had been given to the existence of the Catholic trades' unions in Quebec and their uniqueness consequently goes largely unrealized. Similar organization is to be found nowhere else in the British Empire nor on the American continent. And in the Dominion, save for a small overflow into Ontario where the French have spread, they are concentrated both as to organization and sphere of action in the French Canadian Province.

They are not, however, of Quebec or Canadian origin, being an offshoot of the Catholic union movement which was founded in Germany sixty-five years ago and is now active in a great many European countries. Briefly stated, the aims of the international organization are repudiation of violence and class strife among workers and endeavor to modify society by process of organic and legal evolution.

The movement took root in Canada in 1901 when an industrial dispute which developed in Quebec was settled by the intervention of the Archbishop. Numerous scattered unions, involving many branches of trade, came into being and proceeded to grow. In 1918, an attempt was made to federate these at a meeting at Quebec City. Subsequently conferences took place at Three Rivers and Chicoutimi in 1919 and 1920, respectively, and at the latter the 225 delegates representing the 120 unions then existing decided to establish a central body to coordinate the work of the scattered units and render them more efficient in operation. Thus the Federation of Catholic Workers of Canada came

into existence, the influence of which was destined to produce such splendid result for the betterment of social and economic conditions among the Canadian working classes in general.

Comparatively little was heard of the organization after this date, except for participation in a few small shop strikes, and for the main part the public at large seems to have known very little about it. It is even doubtful if it was regarded very seriously by industry. Certainly, pledged to and adhering to a policy of conciliation and avoidance of strife and to the fostering of reasonable, cooperative relations with employers, it at times drew the ire of rival union bodies which claimed it operated to impede rather than advance improvement of conditions for non-sectarian unionists and workers generally.

Then, suddenly, they exhibited an astonishing aggressiveness, determination and confidence, calling strikes in several rural areas as well as in Montreal. This was climaxed after, and only after, all other means had failed in calling the strike in the textile, one of the largest industries in the Province, in which they compelled recognition of their organization and secured other demands calculated to improve the conditions under which workers in these plants labor. It was at this point that they drew general attention as the public was entirely unprepared for their engagement in a dispute of such magnitude. With a belligerency that is amazing to everyone, they have clearly taken up the cudgels to win better labor conditions in the Province and plainly constituted themselves a real and very definite factor in present and future labor struggles.

The truth is, of course, they have been steadily and quietly developing and strengthening—organizing in unorganized industries, competing with other unions in trades partly organized—ever intent on the achieving of the goal of French Canadian labor enrolled in one federation of unions actuated by Catholic principles. In 1924, the federation had 30,000 members throughout the various trades. A decade later found membership at about the same figure, due in large measure to the disturbance occasioned by economic conditions of the general depression.

Within three years, it enrolled some 15,000 additional workers and membership stands now at about 45,000. On top of improving conditions of employment an impetus to general union expansion, but in particular to the Catholic unions, was given by the Quebec Government's Collective Labor Agreements Act which gave the Labor Minister power to withhold recognition from unions lacking a defined status which closely resembles the basic principles and organization of the Catholic unions.

While the Catholic unions have long recognized they had justification for drastic action they postponed this until they felt they were strong enough in organization to act for a representative body of workers and be thus reasonably sure of victory. Thus when, after every other means of securing their demands had failed, they went into the textile strike they were found to control virtually one hundred per cent of all the workingmen in these plants.

It is shown they are almost as strong in a few other industries, possess a majority membership in others, and in yet others are still battling with rival unions. They are becoming increasingly strong among building artisans, pulp and paper workers, and shoemakers, leading industrial activities in Quebec, while they also have unions among barbers, railway employes, printers, asbestos workers, furniture workers and general laborers, as well as the workers who operate the street-railway system in Montreal.

One is, perhaps, inclined to ask wherein lies the difference between the Catholic unions and any other labor organization, and to question the use of the adjective in the designation. First of all, it must be borne in mind that more than eighty-five per cent of the population of Quebec Province is Catholic. The broad aims and principles of the international organization have been noted and in such a concentration of people of one faith it has been possible to go to more than ordinary lengths to ensure strict adherence to these. The description "Catholic" does not merely imply the union of co-religionists but action that is prompted, guided and restricted by the precepts and pronouncements of the Church.

When first organized, and for some time thereafter, membership in the various unions was restricted to those professing Catholicism, and this is still the case in certain of the exclusively French and Catholic sections of the Province. In others, such as Montreal, as the unions made progress they attracted in increasing numbers non-Catholic workers sympathetic to their aims and their methods and means of attaining them, and these have for some time been admitted on equal terms regardless of religious association.

The spirit of the unions is, however, Catholic in every essential, and their deliberations are keyed to the Papal Encyclicals. The national federation and all local unions have chaplains officially appointed. They are spiritual guides who at the same time oversee proceedings and ensure there is no serious deviation from the line of conduct laid out for labor

by church doctrine. In the smaller communities in the rural districts, where the French-Canadian clergy is so extensively the guide of the people in all its affairs, their importance in the unions is much greater and they exercise considerable power in their active operation and business affairs. Their work in the main, however, is education, as it is the aim of the federation to have workmen in all sections capable of conducting and controlling their own affairs.

Guided by the social principles of the Church, the unions' link with it is necessarily as intimate as it could possibly be. They have naturally been immeasurably aided and strengthened in the public view by the Hierarchy's repeated enunciation of the Catholic attitude towards social and economic problems of the day and periodical pronouncements reflecting antipathy to international unions generally, and those suspected of being infected with Communism in particular.

The Church is, of course, a powerful force with the people of Quebec, and with a government and a labor union sympathetic to Catholic social principles the prospect for harmonious industrial relations in Quebec would appear to be bright. Yet the other two factors in no wise minimize the importance and influence of the Catholic unions in their efforts to banish conditions which have made Quebec widely known for cheap labor. The textile strike was settled apparently by the intervention of Cardinal Villeneuve acting upon Premier Duplessis, but it is in the highest degree improbable that labor in this industry would have secured its demands and deserts had it not been one-hundred per cent organized.

The Catholic unions used the recognized weapons of labor warfare when they felt strong enough to wield them, and justified in having recourse to them because of the failure of all other means of conciliation. They are experiencing additional strength and confidence today by reason of the significant victory which they reasonably feel gives them a greater prestige than ever before enjoyed and is calculated to further swell their ranks and increase their power. Labor, in general, has consequently been brought to the realization of the potential advantage it exercises through well-directed organizations.

At the same time, prevailing sentiment is that the Catholic unions will become the most potent factor in the future in abolishing admittedly deplorable conditions in certain industries in Quebec. With intense interest exhibited by the Catholic Hierarchy in the social and economic welfare of workers, manifested in sympathy with the Catholic unions; with the influence and support of a Provincial Government whose labor legislation and general attitude lean heavily in favor of Catholic unions; the Catholic unions should, from their present position of vantage, go on from strength to strength, and in the general pressure for improved working conditions consequent upon business recovery, bring about in increasing measure better conditions of working and living for the people of Quebec.

SALAZAR, THE INSPIRER OF PORTUGAL'S NEW STATE

The Catholic corporation experiment is successful

LAURENCE K. PATTERSON

PORTUGAL is a small country. Its area is 35,490 square miles, including the Azores and Madeira. Its population in 1930 was 6,825,000. Portugal possesses a considerable colonial empire. In Africa, its dominion extends over 810,000 square miles, with a population of 9,000,000. In Asia, Portugal still retains Macao in China, Goa in India, and a portion of the Island of Timor in the Malay Archipelago.

In the sixteenth century Portugal was a world power. Vasco da Gama circumnavigated the Cape of Good Hope in 1491, and Portugal had conquered and christianized Brazil by 1600. But the golden age gave place to stagnation and decadence. The early nineteenth century was a period of turmoil for Portugal, when the nation passed under the yoke of Masonry and pseudo-Liberalism. But today Portugal, guided by a great Catholic statesman, seems on the way to a social and religious renaissance.

The House of Braganza ruled in Portugal until 1910. During the last forty years of the Monarchy a deceptive peace reigned. There was some industrial improvement, and an increase in trade. Yet the masses groaned under unjust taxation while the national treasury faced bankruptcy. Bread riots were frequent, and seventy per cent of the nation was illiterate. The parliamentary system imitated from England proved a racket. The Progressives were in reality but gangs of frothy rhetoricians. The Church was enslaved, and Freemasonry rode high.

In 1910 the monarchy was overthrown by a military and naval rebellion. King Manuel, whose father, Don Carlos, had been murdered in 1908, was exiled to England. The Republic was proclaimed with fulsome rhetoric. It proved to be a Masonic tyranny. The Jesuits and other religious orders were banished in 1910. Nearly all the bishops were exiled and Church and State were "separated." But this meant the paganizing of education and the violent persecution of the Church. In 1918 President Paes modified the persecuting code, and Portugal resumed diplomatic relations with the Holy See. He was soon assassinated by irate Leftists, but after 1918 active persecution ceased. A religious revival began and the *Centro Catolico* exerted increasing influence.

After the murder of Paes constant military and naval revolts reduced Portugal to semi-chaos. In 1920 reckless inflation caused a paralysis of foreign trade, and bankruptcy seemed imminent. In 1924 the escudo was stabilized at ninety to the pound sterling (about five cents). This reduced wages to a starvation level, causing as a result widespread distress.

In May, 1926, General Gomes da Costa carried out a national revolution. He abolished Parliament, and declared his intention of regenerating the nation. To aid in this task he summoned Dr. Oliveira Salazar from the University of Coimbra. But Salazar failed to obtain the free hand he desired and retired once more to his professorial chair. In 1928 General Carmona, President of the Republic, again summoned Salazar to the post of Minister of Finance. For the last nine years he has been the real ruler of Portugal.

Salazar is not a spectacular figure. Born in 1891 of sturdy peasant stock, he studied philosophy and economics at Coimbra. In 1916 he was appointed professor of Political Economy at his Alma Mater. He wrote for Catholic and economic periodicals, and was an active member of the *Centro Catolico*. By temperament, Dr. Salazar is a scholar, almost a recluse. He is still a bachelor. Neither romance, nor scandal, nor uproar has featured his career. He is a very learned, sincerely pious and most laborious Catholic scholar and gentleman. Until 1928 his life was passed in academic calm at Coimbra. Even today he shuns publicity. Yet in nine years he has largely regenerated Portugal. He has not yet attained the millennium, but he has shown in the concrete the broad initial outlines of the Christian Corporative State.

Salazar declared that increased production of wealth and better distribution of the national income were the only real remedies for Portugal's economic distress. Inflation is a fatal measure. Hence he strove to balance the budget through rigid economy. He purged the national payroll of drones and parasites. By 1934 revenue exceeded expenditure by a substantial margin. Thus the credit of Portugal was restored. The Government is thrifty, efficient and non-political. Through the *Caixa Nacional de Credito* (a national bank) the

State grants credit on easy terms to industrialists and farmers for productive enterprises.

In the political order Salazar suppressed all parties, including his own, the *Centro Catolico*. Since 1930, the *União Nacional* has supplanted all factions. In 1933, after a long period of patient deliberation and debate, the new Constitution (*Estado Novo*) was proclaimed. It is well to note that Salazar himself and many of his colleagues are thoroughly versed in scholastic philosophy and have carefully studied *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*. We should not claim that the *Estado Novo* is the one and only true form of the Catholic Corporative State. But it is an effort, made by an able and learned Catholic statesman, to "implement" *Quadragesimo Anno* for his own nation after a century and more of false Liberalism culminating in revolution and economic collapse. Industry and agriculture are organized along "corporative lines."

It should be noted that Salazar does not champion "State Socialism." For him the state should not own or manage industry and agriculture. But it should organize national production and it should direct and coordinate economic activity for the common good. Salazar is a firm champion of "peasant proprietorship," which he seeks to foster in every possible way. The Corporations embrace cereal production and cattle breeding, wine production, forestry, agriculture outside of grain and cattle production, the fisheries, chemical products, quarries, textiles, electricity, building, transport, typography, credit and insurance, public works, finance, science, art and literature, spiritual and moral interests, national defense, colonies, local government, tourism and sports.

Portugal remains a Republic. Salazar has shown little tendency towards a monarchist restoration. The President is chosen for seven years. In him executive power is vested. The National Assembly consists of ninety members, elected by literate males; women with a diploma also enjoy the right of suffrage. This National Assembly is the organ of legislative power. However, it must accept the guidance of the Council of Ministers and of the Corporative Chamber, which consists of experts chosen by the Corporations enumerated above.

The Constitution was submitted to a referendum and ratified by a majority of six to one.

Salazar has not restored the union of Church and State. Nevertheless, Portugal maintains diplomatic relations with the Holy See, and the Government bases its social and educational program upon Catholic principles. Salazar seeks the aid of the clergy and of religious congregations in combating illiteracy and in promoting the moral welfare of his people. Religion is taught in the primary schools, and is regarded by the present regime as a vital factor in the nation's life. Portugal still suffers from a shortage of priests; there were in 1933 but 3,765 priests in Continental Portugal for a population of 6,500,000 practically all baptized. Of these but 370 were Religious. Sisters are more numerous, but still far too few for the work needed in Portugal today.

Salazar's principles and program are best summarized in his own words, or in those of the Con-

stitution and the Statute of Labor which he has inspired.

According to the Statute of Labor, "the State must coordinate economic activity, check harmful competition and suppress parasitic industries. But the State recognizes in private initiative the most fruitful means of economic progress." Strikes and lockouts are banned in Portugal. On the other hand, the State regulates working hours, inspects factories and guarantees to toilers holidays with pay. Through the Corporations, Salazar seeks to unite labor and capital in an effort for the common good.

Salazar declares that the *Estado Novo* is based on sound national traditions and not upon English Whig teaching or French Revolutionary doctrines. "The family is the irreducible social unit," declares Article 11 of the Constitution. "We seek," asserts Salazar, "to construct a social and corporative state corresponding to the natural structure of society, i.e., families, parishes, townships and corporations. This is an expression of the representative system more faithful than any other."

Is Salazar a Fascist? He denies the label. "Fascism tends towards Caesaro-Papism." "We do not assert the omnipotence of the State." Salazar rejects the totalitarian state because it is "essentially pagan." "Our Constitution imposes upon the State the obligation to respect the natural rights of individuals, of families, of groups and corporations." "The Constitution assures religious freedom and protects parental rights with regard to education." It recognizes the Catholic Church and leaves to it the spiritual care of the people. The regime of Salazar is not totalitarian, but national and authoritarian.

Salazar shuns the use of violence. It is not needed in Portugal. Opposition has dwindled in the face of the social peace and economic prosperity which prevail. Of course, Portugal is still, in many respects, a "backward" country. Salazar cannot transform his fatherland completely in nine years. But Portugal is tranquil and prosperous, an oasis of peace on a continent torn by social unrest and nationalistic hatreds. Much can be learned from a study of Salazar and his work. Within limits, the press is free to criticize his program and methods. Naturally, he must repress Communistic and Anarchistic propaganda. The attempt upon his life last July 4 aroused a nation-wide demonstration of admiration and gratitude towards Salazar. The churches were thronged at *Te Deums* of thanksgiving for the happy escape of "The Savior of Portugal." Salazar rejects the false "Liberalism" which has produced economic maladjustment and moral degeneracy in our civilization. He also spurns the gospel of Marxism in every shape and form. Considering the history of Portugal from the grim dictatorship of Pombal until his advent to power, Salazar's accomplishment has been almost miraculous.

It is well to recall that Salazar, rather than other more prominent figures upon the international stage, is the real "working model" for Franco, Robles and other Catholic leaders in Spain. May God aid their efforts to reconstruct Spain in the spirit of Salazar.

WITH SCRIP AND STAFF

EGGS AND GUNPOWDER

WHEN Lammot du Pont told the Nation Association of Manufacturers, on December 7, that "the bulk of responsibility for future social betterment must be placed on industry's shoulders," he spoke words that no reasonable person can deny. It was heartening to hear him say: "We welcome this responsibility with full confidence in our own and our nation's capacity to discharge it successfully. All that we ask is the same fair opportunity to work that we believe should be given to the humblest citizen."

He spoke as a man of great practical experience when he declared: "New jobs, new wealth, farm prosperity cannot be picked like dreams and theories out of the air. They can be produced only through planned research, planned development. . . . The intelligent planning must be done by industrial management. It carries the risk."

But the confidence that Mr. du Pont builds up in his ability to lead the nation to complete recovery is weakened by the words that enunciate his philosophy of industry. "Industry," he says, "is created by some individual having an idea." "The idea which is the egg from which each industry hatches is *always one particular idea*—namely, how a profit can be made. If it develops that a profit cannot be made, the industry is never hatched. Or if it develops after hatching, that it cannot operate at a profit, the industry dies." (*Italics mine.*)

So, according to Mr. du Pont, the germ, the original idea, the prime starting point of industry is someone's idea how a profit can be made, viz. *for himself*.

Thus the response given by a small-town Massachusetts newspaper to a young man out work who wonders how he can raise his salary, quoted by the *New Yorker* for November 27: "Salaries are paid on the basis of profit to the employer, not because a man has youngsters to feed. Ideas pay."

Without realizing it, Mr. du Pont has put his finger on the rotten spot of our industrial system, the notion that if industry is to create jobs for men, its *primary* motive, its starting point, the "egg from which it is hatched," must be profit for the *entrepreneur*, and not the objective needs of the human person. Mr. du Pont may not have meant so bold a proposition, but it is a pity his words are not more qualified. Many will accept them without the reservations he makes in his own mind.

Let it be clearly understood that I am not hereby rejecting the profit motive as an important, usually necessary, incentive to private industry. Leaving aside other forms of organized economic effort, such as legitimate governmental industry, cooperatives, and the vocational group or guild system,

which are clearly not organized upon the basis of private profit, we are still not obliged to make the personal gain of the *entrepreneur* the sole idea from which his industry is hatched. Mr. du Pont himself, in theory and for a time at least, is perfectly capable of conducting the du Pont de Nemours munitions industry from the idealistic motive of supplying the nation with the arms necessary for its defense.

If the industrialist is wholly a Christian, if he is penetrated by the "Catholic Standard" which I have recommended for politicians, the first question he will ask himself, before undertaking to manufacture a product, is: "Do people need it?" And by people he will mean not merely prospective customers, whose needs interest him solely as something created to stimulate purchasing of goods, but their objective and human needs: the needs of families, the needs of society for the common good. Do people, for instance, as members of society, as fathers or mothers of families, living in houses, need better window-sashes? If so, I shall manufacture them at a *reasonable* profit for myself, and for the good of these customers, and for the personal welfare of those employed in the manufacture. If I find my profit excessive, I shall see that it is shared.

Judgment, therefore, on the utilization of the "10,000 new metal alloys and more than 250,000 new compounds of chemicals," in which Mr. du Pont sees the hope of millions of new jobs for unemployed America, will be determined by the intensely vital question whether the exploitation of these alloys and chemicals will correspond to the real, basic needs of men and their families, in the interests of the common good, or whether they are to be exploited merely by creation of new and artificial wants, that will render life needlessly complicated and make man still more helpless than he is against the problem of subsistence when a cog slips in the industrial structure. Mr. du Pont sheds no light on that question. My misgivings are quite as great whether this exploitation be undertaken by industry kept strictly "private" according to the norms of the National Manufacturers Association, or whether it be run for the equally private profit of a centralized dictatorship, as in Soviet Russia, and as many say we are threatened with in the United States. The "egg" from which it all hatches is the same.

The human person is bound to come to the fore, du Ponts or no du Ponts. Italian Fascism, by a stroke of genius, placed the human person ahead of private profit, and thereby won the allegiance of spiritually-minded persons who otherwise reject its principles. If we do not want Fascism in this country, we should read the signs of the times, and place in private industry the human person where he belongs.

JOHN LAFARGE

PICKETING

SOME labor leaders in New York seem to think that day lost on which they do not do something to offend the public. Apparently they have never learned that no movement gets very far in this country, whether it be a labor union or a scheme backed by Federal legislation, unless it wins the support of the public. All that may be very wrong and very sad, but when the admission is made, what is left is a very wrong and a very sad fact.

What we have in mind particularly is the eruption of picketing on the streets of the metropolis. Picketing is a right supported by the law. But is picketing advisable when the pickets make public nuisances of themselves?

Picketing, as a right, is subject to limitations in its exercise. If a strike is unjustified, picketing to promote the strike is likewise unjustified. Granting the justice of the strike, however, it does not follow that the rights of the public may be set aside merely because the strikers wish to advertise their cause. The public has a right to be protected against molestation in the public streets, and it is no defense for the strikers to hold that picketing of this kind is an essential part of justifiable advertising. Picketing, like the strike itself, must be carried on with due regard for rights wherever they exist.

Of course, there can be no justification for picketing accompanied by profane or indecent language directed against persons who wish to patronize the picketed shop or factory. Still less is personal violence justified. There have not been many cases in New York of personal violence, but there has been far too much violence of the verbal type. If the strike directors believe that this conduct conciliates public favor, the public will soon disabuse them. Already instances are reported of men making purchases at shops primarily because these were picketed.

According to the *New York Post*, a journal that will not be suspected of ultra-conservatism, a new and most objectionable form of picketing is making its appearance. John Smith, who employs union labor and has no quarrel with any union, comes to his place of business and finds it picketed. The reason assigned is that he is doing business with some firm that is in trouble because two different unions are fighting for supremacy. Smith is not involved in this fight, and he has no way of knowing which side is right, but he is made to suffer, although he is innocent. It will be hard to convince Smith that organized labor benefits him as well as his workers. And it will be harder to convince the public that hears of this picketing.

As we have often stated, we are friends of organized labor and we wish to see labor free itself from excesses. But if we were an enemy of organized labor, we would applaud as often as labor made a fool of itself. Organized labor, at least in New York, seems to congratulate itself on friends of that applauding type. Let it continue that infatuation, and it will find itself deserted by the public, and probably subjected to an unwelcome State supervision.

TO THE LEFT

MANY write complaining that this Review, after having been in the progressive forefront, has now tended toward reaction. These correspondents belong to the very actively propagandistic group of Catholic radicals. They yearn and war for social justice, talk undogmatically about the Mystical Body, and attack the capitalistic system in all its roots and growths. Opposing Communism, they borrow Communist methods and seek for points of agreement between the Communist and Catholic. They are the skirmishers beyond the lines of the solid Catholic front which AMERICA leads.

COURTS AND SCHOOLS

WE observe that in the letter of the Protestant clergy to Hitler, Dorothy Thompson sees the beginning of a revolt in Germany. The clergy would never have dared address the Fuehrer in this open fashion were they not aware that a large part of the army is becoming discontented, and that in every section of the country decent citizens are eagerly awaiting the hour when, in union with the army, they can end the shocking tyranny which now oppresses Germany. It may be that Miss Thompson is correct, and we pray that she is.

In the meantime the persecution of Catholics who wish to give their children a religious education continues. Toward the end of last month the courts in Frankfurt-on-Main issued a decree—it can hardly be called a “decision” in the American sense—which, according to an official journal, the *Deutsches Recht*, will hereafter be generally enforced. The case was that of a mother who entrusted her daughter to a convent boarding-school and her son to a school conducted, in the words of the report, as a “monastery school.” In doing this, the court held that she had “abused the rights of guardianship.”

This decision has been received with pleasure by Nazi officials. We commend it to the attention of the German Ambassador at Washington, who, in an address in New York last Summer, had the effrontery to assure his audience that no word was dearer to Hitler than “liberty.” Doubtless the Ambassador was right, if by “liberty” he meant freedom for Hitler and his

TO THE RIGHT

MANY complain of the policies of this Review, but do not write. They cancel subscriptions or refuse to read it because it is too radical. They belong to the capitalistic strata of Catholics, are imbedded in the old era of higher and lower classes based on wealth and family, think the laboring man should be content with poverty and the rich have a right to luxury. They are deeply disturbed by the whole Roosevelt revolution and find nothing more execrable than economic Communism. They are the solid bloc of camp followers, loathe to keep up with AMERICA and the Catholic progressives.

SCHOOLS IN GERMANY

cohorts to suppress the liberty of everyone who disagreed with them. The word is often on the lips of German officials, for it is a favorite word with all tyrants, but liberty itself is unknown in Germany.

The German decree carries us back half a score of years to our own country when a similar law, originating in Oregon, was brought before the Supreme Court. It is almost amusing to note that the principles on which the Court rejected the Oregon law had been discussed some years previously in a case involving a professor who, contrary to the law of the State of Nebraska, had presumed to teach German in a Lutheran parish school. The Supreme Court had held that no reason of great public interest could be alleged to justify this law, and that if parents wished to send their children to a school in which they could learn German, it was their constitutional right to do this. Oregon antedated Hitler by more than ten years, but, fortunately, the United States has courts of justice, while in Germany courts take their orders from the autocratic officials of the Nazi Government.

As long as the Supreme Court retains its independence, another Oregon law is impossible. But while we sympathize with Catholics in Germany, deprived of their right to control the education of their children, it might be more profitable to consider the value we place on our right to conduct schools. Surely, we do not value it highly enough if we fail to support our schools.

THE MASKED ENEMY

SOME Catholics affect to see no danger in Communism as it exists in this country. Our people are too much attached to old ideals, they say, to be caught by any scheme which proposes to take their property away from them. No man who has slaved for years to own his little house, or who has managed to put away enough to safeguard his old age, can be deceived by propaganda from Moscow. We Americans may seem to be an over-tolerant sort of people at times, they continue, and we put up with all sorts of cranks, but the country will rise as one man once its essential liberties are touched. Thereat they go their way, these easy Catholics, certain that all is, and will ever be, well.

Probably an even greater number of non-Catholics fall into this way of thinking, so that in the end the number of Americans who laugh at the idea of Communism gaining a foothold in the United States is fairly large. But they are laboring under a gross delusion when they think that Communism in the United States proposes to take any man's property or savings away from him. Any propagandist could tell them that a move of that nature would be fatal, and Communists have nothing to learn from any propagandist or public-relations consultant in these simple United States.

What the Communists do is to announce that they have a plan under which every man will own his home, and will be assured a competence in his old age. Far from attacking the Constitution of the United States, the Communists assert undying devotion to it. If we are not in error, Earl Browder, who sought the Presidency last year on a platform of Communism, was responsible for addresses which made Messrs. Roosevelt and Landon (is that the name?) look like rather dubious supporters of the Constitution and the Grand Old Flag.

Those who have read and, we hope, have studied that splendid letter on labor problems issued last month by the Bishops who comprise the administrative board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, are well aware that the Bishops of the Catholic Church in this country do not share the easy attitude toward Communism affected by some Catholics. On the contrary, they see Communism in the United States as "a crusading spirit, a contagious hysteria," an organized group which makes capital of the undoubted economic inequalities and injustices which exist in this country, and masquerades as "the champion of the downtrodden, the arch-enemy of capitalistic abuses, and the redeemer of the poor and the working classes." In other words, Communism is adopting for its own purposes a platform which is Catholic, and is taking a position Catholics should be the first to take.

It matters not that Communism will never fulfil one of these promises, and that its atheistic principles and violent practices will destroy, if it can, Christianity, and with it civilization. The point here is that Communism is not roaring like a lion in this country. It is cooing like a sucking dove. While we in the pleached gardens of our fancied security

listen to the soft notes at even-tide, Communism gets in its real work out in the busy streets.

The American Bishops are not alarmists. They are remarkably calm men. They know their dioceses, and since they have nothing to gain by misrepresentation, any joint report made by them on a subject like capital and labor has a value that is unique. Hence, when they tell us that Communism is a danger, not remote but at our doors, that it is at work in our colleges, that it is enrolling young people, that it is winning recruits because of "the growing articulate discontent among the masses of the people," they are not indulging in sensationalism, but reporting what they know. Many Americans, unfortunately, who are helping to spread Communism would indignantly deny all affiliations with Communism. As the Bishops write:

Many of the promoters of organizations calling themselves peace and youth movements, sponsors of stage and screen entertainment, and so-called crusaders for "democracy," especially those upholding the Communism of Spain and refusing to condemn the Bolshevism of Russia, are consciously or unconsciously propagandists and agents of Communism. They constitute part of the "United" or "Popular Front."

In view of this grave warning, based on facts known to the Bishops, no Catholic can intelligently maintain the position that Communism is not a danger in this country. The enemy is at the gates, not as an enemy, but masquerading as a friend.

PULL TOGETHER!

FOUR years ago, under plea of "emergency," methods were used by the Government which can hardly be reconciled with the ideals, or even with the letter, of constitutional procedure. For years great corporations had operated with small reference to the common welfare, their sole purpose being to show a profit. This anti-social conduct prepared the way for the great financial depression, and it was but natural that the public, in a mood of resentment, was not disposed to look with a too critical eye on methods designed to align the corporations.

But resentment is a poor basis for legislation. There is such a thing as cutting off one's nose to spite one's face. As John L. Lewis pointed out a few weeks ago, it is now advisable to cooperate with these chastened criminals. Miners cannot make any money when the mine-owners are going in the red. Nor can any wage-earner continue to draw his pay after the employer is forced to close down.

Addressing a convocation at Union College early in December, Bernard M. Baruch asked: "Who is responsible for the present unrest?" And answered: "There is enough blame to pass all around." As a remedy, he proposed that "the Government and business work together for the benefit of all concerned." It is possible to regulate business without destroying, to punish corporate malefactors without ruining the small business man who is doing the best he can for his employees. Business, the Government and the public must work together if we are to get out of this depression.

SALVATION OF GOD

EVIL days had come upon the people of God. For centuries the voice of no prophet had been heard in the land. Here and there wise and holy men pondered the Scriptures, and watched for the coming of the promised Messiah. God gave to Moses only a glimpse of the land which His people were to inhabit, but for some chosen souls He had reserved the happiness of looking upon the Messiah, of talking with Him, of listening to His Gospel of peace.

Perhaps at no time were the souls of good men more sorely tried than in the days immediately preceding the public life of Our Lord. There was social and economic unrest. The Romans had profaned the Temple, and the people groaned under a pagan yoke. There was religious unrest, too, and all over the land false prophets were rising up to disturb the minds of the people, claiming that at last the Messiah had been revealed in them. But just at this time, "the word of the Lord came to John, the son of Zachary, in the desert," and God raised up for the consolation of those who had waited and prayed in silence, a true prophet.

A striking picture is given in the Gospel (Saint Luke, iii, 1-6) read tomorrow. John has begun his mission. Stern and unyielding with sin, he loved repentant sinners, and welcomed them. He gathered them about him in his desert retreat along the western shores of the Dead Sea, and there he preached "the baptism of penance for the remission of sin." Later he was to lead them and many others into "the country about the Jordan," and there they would go down into the waters in a rite which signified the cleansing from sin. Even the greatest of all the sons of men, the Incarnate God Himself, Whose work was to save sinners, would present Himself to the Baptist, and in the presence of the crowd, sinless as He was, be baptized.

His preaching, couched in the strong and picturesque words of Isaias the prophet, soon rang throughout the land. He told the people that his was the voice of one crying in the wilderness: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight his paths. Every valley shall be filled, and every hill and mountain be brought low: and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough ways plain: and all flesh shall see the salvation of God." Later it was said of Our Blessed Lord that the poor people heard Him gladly. Gladly, too, they must have heard the words of John: "All flesh shall see the salvation of God."

To us as well are these words spoken, and our hearts should leap with joy at the thought that in Our Lord we "shall see the salvation of God." But it is eternally true that they only shall see this salvation who prepare their hearts for it. Our hearts are a rough land, mountainous and steep, with valleys tangled with briars and thorns, and the way into it is difficult. But in the few days that remain before the Messiah appears, we can strive by penance to level the mountains, and fill the valleys, and make straight the ways. Then He will come to us, and in Him we shall "see the salvation of God."

CHRONICLE

THE CONGRESS. Held over from the last Session by the Rules Committee, the Wages and Hours Bill was released for consideration in the House. A petition was signed by 218 Representatives. The debate on the bill began, officially, this past week. Amendments have piled up. The House bill differs much from the Senate bill passed last session. Both the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. stand against the bill as now written. It will doubtless be returned to the Labor Committee for final drafting. . . . Both Houses concentrated in debate on the Farm Bill. Particular wrath was heaped on Secretary Wallace's suggestions for production control. Senator King saw in the plan a "trend away from democratic ideals and toward a dictatorial, centralized form of Government." Senator Borah found it to be "an unconstitutional attempt to place the American farmer under complete bureaucratic control and to curtail the nation's food supply at a time when millions were hungry." Secretary Wallace warned that the bill might cost the treasury more than \$1,000,000,000 a year. The House, considering a more moderate measure, in the first test voted against compulsory marketing control and penalty taxes on the accumulation of large surpluses of wheat. On the question of cotton, the House reversed its position, and voted compulsory marketing control. . . . Recommendations from the Budget Bureau that there be reductions approximating \$800,000,000 in the new estimates were well received by economy-leaders in both Houses. Though there was opposition to every reduction suggested, the common sentiment was that appropriations must be kept within the limit and a balanced budget must be assured.

— — —

THE ADMINISTRATION. The Secretaries issued reports and delivered addresses. Mr. Roper, in his annual report for the fiscal year, urged greater business research, an adequate investigation of trade and business. Since the trend has been away from agriculture, the number of people dependent upon industry and commerce has increased. Stressing the need for close cooperation between government and business, he praised the help offered by the recommendations of the Business Advisory Council. . . . Secretary Ickes, speaking before the American Civil Liberties Union, struck out against those who "pretending that they would save us from dreadful Communism would superimpose upon America an equally dreadful Fascism." In regard to the Supreme Court, he charged that "the Court has gone far to convert the Bill of Rights, which was intended as a charter of human freedom, into a charter of corporate privileges." . . . In a coast-to-coast broadcast, Secretary Wallace offered a seven-point program through which business,

labor, agriculture and the Government should cooperate "in a common sense way to resume the recovery march." He did not believe that either tax-revision or budget-balancing would of themselves cure the present business recession. . . . Secretary Morgenthau, in a press conference, said that the investigations being made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue into incomes over \$100,000 had no connection with any plan for taxing capital assets. The data, he said, would be held confidential. . . . Secretary Hull answered the nine questions addressed to President Roosevelt by Representative Case, of South Dakota, on American policy in the Sino-Japanese conflict. In answer seven, he states that "the President of the United States has not found 'that there exists a state of war.'" In answer eight, he maintains that "the restrictive provisions of the Neutrality Act of May 1, 1937, is left to and is dependent upon decision of the President by a finding that 'there exists a state of war.'"

— — —

WASHINGTON ITEMS. William E. Dodd resigned as Ambassador to Germany. He did not agree with the National Socialist policies of Nazi Germany, and so expressed himself in addresses in the United States. Hugh R. Wilson, Assistant Secretary of State, would be presented to the Senate, it was asserted, as the next Ambassador. . . . Robert W. Bingham tendered his resignation as Ambassador to Great Britain. His reason was ill health. The President was reported as offering the post to Joseph P. Kennedy, chairman of the Maritime Commission, from which office Mr. Kennedy was preparing to retire, having completed the survey of the merchant marine. . . . Thirty-one decisions awaited the Supreme Court in the week of December 4. The first two cases of importance were both five-to-four rulings in favor of the Administration. One concerned the taxing of gross incomes of contractors on governmental projects; the other cleared the way for action against the Aluminum Company of America in trust-law charges. . . . The conferences between William Green and John L. Lewis halted on the question of jurisdictional authority over the C. I. O. unions. A full report of the collapse will be made to the ten A. F. of L. and the three C. I. O. members of the peace committee.

— — —

SPAIN. Stalemate on all fronts characterized military action. Except for intermittent bombing of the Madrid line by air and artillery and of Barcelona from the air by the Nationalists, and the bombing of the Aragon front by the Loyalists, no major activity was reported. The deadline for unconditional surrender of the present Government now located at Barcelona, as demanded by Generalissimo

Franco, at Barcelona was ended on December 6. A concentrated drive on one or other front by the Franco forces was daily expected; it was postponed, probably, because of severe weather conditions. The reopening of the United States consulate at Bilbao was reported delayed owing to the refusal of Consul W. E. Chapman to have any direct contact with Señor Antonio San Groniz, Chief of General Franco's diplomatic cabinet. Consul Chapman advised Washington that his movements between Saint Jean-de-Luz and Bilbao were obstructed by the Franco military authorities. He claimed that the demand for recognition of the Franco *de facto* Government by the United States was the reason for this obstruction. In reply to the charge of Mr. Chapman, Señor San Groniz disclaimed any responsibility for the obstruction, and insisted that he was merely anxious to ascertain the plans and wishes of the United States relative to the reopening of the consulate at Bilbao, affirmed that recognition on the part of the American Government was never demanded as a condition for the reopening of the consulate.

FRANCE. Foreign Minister Yvon Delbos headed for Warsaw as the first stop in the series of diplomatic visits to France's Eastern and Central European allies. But while the anxious eyes of his fellow citizens watched him move on to Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Rumania, the Chamber of Deputies began its discussion of the national budget. Armament and military measures came sharply to the fore when Defense Minister Daladier pointed to what he called the nation's inadequate barriers against perils on the eastern and south-eastern frontiers. To the accompaniment of cheers from the Deputies and without a single dissenting vote, the Minister obtained the passage of next year's military credits, totaling close to 13,000,000,000 francs.

GREAT BRITAIN. In what the London *Daily Express* described as probably the most revolutionary change the War Office has ever known, all the older military members of the Army Council, Britain's supreme military directorate, were forced out of their posts in Mr. Hore-Belisha's sudden reorganization of the Army. Younger men, chosen with total disregard for seniority rights, were appointed to the Council and the average age of the Council was reduced from sixty-three to fifty-two. Major General Gort was jumped over the heads of fifty older men to the highest post of Chief of Staff. . . . Startling as was this military news, it was forced to yield in public attention to the interest aroused by the latest published figures on British unemployment. Despite the fact that Government expenditures were at a high peak, especially for armaments, and that heavy industry was operating at capacity, the labor figures indicated a sharp increase in unemployment in what were classified as the basis industries effecting the consumer and distributor.

RUSSIA. Distrust and unquiet continued to plague Soviet business and diplomatic circles. Rumors persisted that Valery I. Mezhlauk, chairman of the State Planning Commission and one time mentioned as possible Ambassador to the United States, was in difficulties. Braving the danger of assassination or kidnaping abroad, Alexander Barmin, former Soviet chargé d'affaires at Athens, Greece, and veteran diplomat, disobeyed his recall order and took a train to Paris. Thence he sent in his letter of resignation to the Soviet authorities. He also issued a vehement protest to the French public against "trumped-up" Soviet accusations. W. Krivitsky, member of the Communist party and recently head of the War Industries in Moscow, also claimed French protection.

JUGOSLAV MINISTER'S JOURNEY. Premier Milan Stoyadinovich of Yugoslavia acted as mediator between Hungary and Italy in his talks in Rome with the Duce and his officials. He was reported as assuring the Italians that full guarantees would be offered by the Little Entente as to Hungarian minorities in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. In the meanwhile, Hubert Harrison, correspondent of the New York *Times* and of Reuters, British news agency, was expelled from Belgrade because of his reporting concerning Government action against a local comic strip, with alleged political tendency.

CHINA AND JAPAN. Japanese troops, by a swift advance, reached the walls of Nanking on December 6. Held up there, they sent ninety bombing planes over the city, and prepared to lay siege to the capital. But the Government of China had fled therefrom a fortnight ago. The \$3,000,000 tomb of Sun Yat Sen, one of the most impressive monuments of the world, set on the slopes of Purple Mountain, was reported as in the hands of the Japanese. Three British vessels were bombed at Wuhu, near Nanking, by Japanese raiders. Hundreds of refugees on the vessels were reported as killed or wounded. On the Tangshan road, twelve miles from Nanking, 300 Chinese soldiers were destroyed by the Japanese on the summit of a cone-shaped peak. . . . At Shanghai United States marines halted a Japanese attempt to seize a large part of the International Settlement. The Japanese also abandoned a plan to march through the French Concession to Nantao.

GERMANY. Count Konrad von Preysing, Bishop of Berlin, had read from the pulpits of his diocese on December 5 a letter denouncing Church Minister Hanns Kerrls' assertions that the Nazi regime was not attacking Christianity. The Bishop replied that the Nazis were robbing German Christians of freedom of conscience and liberty of worship and gave instances. Two days later the Hitler Elite Guard, in its official organ, *Das Schwarze Korps*, formally recognized the existence in Germany of a "state [neopagan] religion" above and independent of the Christian churches.

CORRESPONDENCE

GEORGISM VS COMMUNISM

EDITOR: In a letter published in your correspondence column (December 4) H. Ellenoff asked himself the question: "Who were the two greatest opponents of Communism in the United States?" To which he answered: "Were they not Henry George and Dr. McGlynn?" And I, when I read his rather astonishing reply, asked myself: What could smell more like one of the principal tenets of Communism than this passage taken from a letter to Archbishop Corrigan by Dr. McGlynn?

I have taught and I shall continue to teach, in speeches and writings, as long as I live, that land is rightfully the property of the people in common and that private ownership of land is against natural justice . . . and I would bring about instantly, if I could, such change of laws, all the world over, as would confiscate private property in land without one penny of compensation to the miscalled owners.

Dr. McGlynn preached this doctrine of Henry George whenever and wherever he had a chance to do so. This was the prime issue in his trouble with the Catholic Church. Perhaps, H. Ellenoff has confused "exponent" with "opponent." Perhaps, if the Catholic Church had accepted the Georgist cause and its land economy, Communism would not be threatening us today but be commanding us.

In conclusion may I recommend to H. Ellenoff Volume III of Frederick Zwieler's *Life and Letters of Bishop McQuaid* for a true picture of Dr. McGlynn; then he might be tempted to ring the gong on Mr. Bell and his heroes for their deluding performances.

New York, N. Y.

JEREMIAH O'DONOGHUE

IMPECUNIOUS RETREATANTS

EDITOR: In a recent letter to AMERICA (October 30) Dan Connolly complained of the absence of poor workers at retreat houses. I really do not know what retreat houses the said Mr. Connolly attended, but from what I observed personally in Pittsburgh, Penna., Brighton, Mass., West Springfield, Mass., Scranton, Penna., Dunkirk, N. Y., and Jamaica, N. Y., that statement is incorrect. From what I have been told about Mayslake in Chicago, the retreats conducted at Silver Creek, N. Y., and Malvern, Penna., again I say the statement made by Mr. Connolly is incorrect.

The only one who would know that a man is not in a position to help the retreat movement financially while he is on retreat, would be the retreat director, and he informs nobody of the fact.

It is sad that a Catholic gentleman, as undoubtedly Mr. Connolly is, should make a statement which he can't prove—except to prove that he is wrong. I would advise that Mr. Connolly go to more

of our retreat houses and ascertain the real facts from those who know. Then when he does make a statement—he will not be compelled to add: "But, maybe I'm wrong."

Jamaica, N. Y. COSMAS SHAUGHNESSY, C.P.

CATHOLIC APATHY

EDITOR: The apathy of Catholics toward the Catholic press is one of the most deplorable things, and non-Catholics know this, naturally. I have sent a copy of AMERICA (November 6) to the Associated Press so it may know that one lone Catholic reads the Catholic press. I have marked Father Toomey's article for notice on its policy.

Williamstown, Mass.

H. MCSHERRY

INDIAN HELP

EDITOR: The Marquette League for Catholic Indian Missions, with offices at 105 East 22nd Street, New York City, again follows its usual practice of making a special appeal at Christmas for our needy Indian missions. This year the appeal is in response to the urgent request of His Excellency, the Most Rev. Aloysius J. Muench, D.D., Bishop of Fargo.

Bishop Muench was installed as the Bishop of Fargo just two years ago. During that short period of time he has proven himself to be most solicitous for the spiritual and material welfare of the Indian members of his flock.

We must help this zealous Bishop in his work among the Indians of his diocese. The Benedictine Fathers and Grey Nuns have done splendid work among the boys and girls of these tribes. I can assure you that, unless a generous response is made to this appeal, his schools may be compelled to close their doors because of the lack of financial help to carry on this great missionary work.

I know our Catholic people and friends of our Indian missions will desire, if at all possible, to send this apostolic Bishop a real substantial fund to keep his worthy schools going until times get better.

New York, N. Y. REV. BERNARD A. CULLEN
Director General

BOUQUET

EDITOR: May I express my appreciation of the unaffected sanity of AMERICA's attitude towards the problems of the day. Its views on Spain and world peace are those of Catholics the world over, while its policy on matters of purely American concern seems to an onlooker to be most reasonable.

Victoria, Australia WILLIAM M. KERRIGAN

LITERATURE AND ARTS

PREMATURE REPORT STARTS SOME CATHOLIC PRESS HISTORY

THOMAS F. MEEHAN

IT was announced from Pittsburgh, Pa., that the *Catholic*, founded there in 1844, suspended publication on November 4, leaving the *Boston Pilot*, founded by Patrick Donahoe, in 1836, the sole survivor of the Catholic weeklies of the pioneer era of the first half of the nineteenth century, the honor roll headed by Bishop England's *Charleston, S. C. United States Catholic Miscellany*, June 5, 1822, the principles of which, according to the prospectus, were to be: "Candor, moderation, fidelity, charity and diligence." Pittsburgh has still, we are glad to know, its place on the honor roll for the venerable *Catholic* has been revived after these weeks of inanimation.

The story of the Pittsburgh *Catholic* is one of the most interesting in the records of the pioneer weeklies. When, at the suggestion of the Fifth Provincial Council of Baltimore (May 1843) the new Diocese of Pittsburgh was erected on August 11, 1843, the Rev. Dr. Michael O'Connor, one of the most brilliant lights in the annals of the American hierarchy, was named its first Bishop. He was consecrated in Rome, where he was well known as the former professor of Sacred Scripture at the Propaganda, and vice-rector of the Irish College. On his way back to his new charge, he visited his native Ireland and secured eight seminarians and a community of seven of the recently founded Sisters of Mercy to aid him in his work. In the following year the first diocesan synod was held; a chapel for colored Catholics was opened and the publication of a weekly paper, the *Catholic*, was begun on March 16, 1844, with J. F. Boylan as proprietor and manager. In 1847 he sold it to Jacob Porter and Henry McNaughton, the former remaining as proprietor for the following forty-four years.

Bishop O'Connor's administration was most successful in every way, but, in May 1860, he carried out a long cherished purpose, resigned the See and entered the Society of Jesus. As a Jesuit he labored with equal energy and zeal in teaching, preaching and lecturing throughout the United States and Canada until his death, October 18, 1872, in his sixty-third year. In addition to his literary facilities and versatility he was an accomplished linguist,

speaking six modern languages, and when the *Catholic* was started he contributed regularly to its editorial and other contents. This soon gave the paper national prestige and prominence. It was the era of constant controversy, theological, social and political, and what appeared in the *Catholic* attained widespread interest and divided honors in the field of apologetics with Bishop Purcell's *Cincinnati Catholic Telegraph*; James A. McMaster's *Freeman's Journal*; Brownson's *Review*, and Dr. Charles I. White's *Baltimore Catholic Mirror* and the *Metropolitan Magazine*.

The *Catholic* joined with Bishop Purcell in the first printed criticisms controverting John Henry Newman's *Theory of Development*. When in 1853 it was proposed to make Newman the head of the new Catholic University of Ireland the Irish Nationalist papers here regarded it as part of an attempt to Anglo-Saxonize the Irish, and this opposition also helped to defeat Newman's plan to have Brownson accept an invitation to become a member of the University faculty. As a son of "Rebel Cork," Bishop O'Connor in the *Catholic* was not unsympathetic to the opposition side.

When Brownson, after much consideration, became confirmed in the conviction that the supremacy of the spiritual order was the one medium of the reconciliation of civil and religious freedom with authority, Bishop O'Connor in the Pittsburgh *Catholic* and Bishop Purcell in the *Cincinnati Telegraph* opposed this contention. In connection with this, a letter Brownson wrote the editor of the *Catholic* from Boston, August 1, 1854, about one of the Bishop's efforts, throws an interesting light on the way the elect carried on their disputes in those days. He said:

I have just read your article devoted to me in your paper of last week. For the kind and considerate tone in which you speak of me personally—the tone of a Christian gentleman, and which I have seldom been greeted with in any one who differed from me—you must permit me to thank you with tears of gratitude in my eyes. I do not know why it is that my brethren who differ from me, usually express their differences in a harsh, sneering, contemptuous tone, or why they almost always make it a personal affair, and refuse me the ordinary

courtesy due from one gentleman to another. In the present storm of indignation which I have unwittingly excited, I am happy to acknowledge the *Metropolitan Magazine*, the *Catholic Herald*, and the *Pittsburgh Catholic*, honorable exceptions to the general rule of a portion of the Catholic press of the country in my regard when they do not agree with me.

The Bishop, in the *Catholic*, took issue also with Brownson on the question of Catholic versus Public Schools, but Brownson claimed that the criticism misstated and distorted what he had published on the subject. While he never hesitated to criticize the famous essayist and philosopher if he thought it necessary, the Bishop continued his admiring personal friendship to the end.

On the national problems of Native Americanism, Slavery and the Civil War, the *Pittsburgh Catholic* was held as an authoritative exponent of Catholic opinion. In 1861 it had a protracted controversy, taking the anti-Secession view, with the *Baltimore Catholic Mirror*.

One of its editors was the Rev. Hugh P. Gallagher, who later went to San Francisco, where he was rector of the Cathedral for a number of years during Archbishop Alemany's administration. He started and edited, in 1853, San Francisco's first weekly, the *Catholic Standard*. In 1854, the Archbishop sent him to Ireland to get assistants in the work of the diocese and he returned with foundations of Presentation Nuns and of Sisters of Mercy. At the head of the latter was Mother Mary Baptist Russell, sister of Lord Russell of Killowen, Lord Chancellor of England, and of the celebrated Irish Jesuit, Father Matthew Russell, editor of the *Irish Monthly*, the magazine in which so many now noted writers won literary fame.

Another editor of the *Catholic* was Francis P. Smith, who took up that position in 1890, and carried on for more than forty years after, trusted and respected by six occupants of the See. Bishop Boyle said of him (then in his eighty-fourth year) when the *Catholic* dedicated the issue of April 15, 1926, to honor Mr. Smith:

His editorials have been an armory of educational argument and opinion, whence other protagonists of the cause have taken weapons for the field of combat. . . . His unfailing good nature and graciousness showed themselves in everything he wrote, and contributed enormously to the influence which his editorial writings exerted and to the conviction which they carried.

Archbishop Canevin often contributed to the *Catholic* and notably made it the medium of his valuable statistical survey of the loss and gain of the Church in its progress in the United States.

Even with the revival of the *Catholic*, the leading German language weekly, *Der Wanderer*, of St. Paul, Minn., begun in 1867, pushes high up on the seniority list. It has in recent years an English "Companion," the *Wanderer*, one of our most scholarly, authoritative and best edited weeklies interpreting the news and issues of the day affecting Catholics. The Archbishop of St. Paul, on October 15, in a well-merited letter to the editor, Joseph Matt, K.S.G., complimenting him on *Der Wanderer's* seventieth birthday and his own forty years of

editorial direction, felicitated them "on the contribution made by both to the apostolate of the Catholic press."

This is the centennial year of the German language weeklies. The first, the *Wahrheitsfreund* (Friend of Truth) was started in Cincinnati, July 20, 1837, by Father Martin John Henni, later Archbishop of Milwaukee, to support a local orphan asylum. It suspended in 1910 and was the forerunner of a continental chain of German papers, two dailies and twenty-eight weeklies which has now dwindled to ten weeklies.

There was a sad note, of course, in the report of the passing of the *Catholic*, a name so long honored in the roll of seniority. But that does not indicate any gloom in the general outlook. The top of the list, the *Boston Pilot* (1836), is a fine well-conducted, attractive and satisfactory paper, evidencing prosperity on its every page. It is a splendid monument to its valiant founder, Patrick Donahoe, who, with undaunted courage, fronted "the twin jailers of the daring heart," and vanquished them in three major battles. New England can well present him as an ideal for Catholic lay-action and keep in constant memory all he accomplished for the progress of the Faith and the welfare of his fellow men.

In various sections of the country drives for the promotion of the circulation of diocesan weeklies have had the most satisfactory results. The Press Bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which has accomplished so much for the improvement and uplift of the Catholic press, reports that it is now serving 112 subscribers, or 437 publications, in twenty-one countries, with its comprehensive weekly records of the news of the day of interest to Catholics and concerning Catholic activities at home and abroad. Four new diocesan weeklies have been started during the past year, 1936-37.

A survey of the Catholic weeklies in England, Ireland, Canada, Australia, India and South America shows as much practical activity and application of modernized journalistic methods, with culture and courage for the propaganda of the truth in the editing of these papers, as we can claim is exhibited with special vigor here at home.

One of the very pleasant experiences of the regular perusal of the Catholic weeklies of the English speaking world is the evidence of how much AMERICA's esteemed contemporaries appreciate the contents of its pages. The editors, at home and abroad, in all quarters of the globe, pay AMERICA the compliment of reprinting for their readers many of the contributions that have been published in this Review, and so justify the claim that AMERICA is the most widely quoted paper of its character in the English-speaking Catholic journalistic world. It is a very interesting experience to note the curious variety in the items that strike the fancy of the many editors who cull from its pages what they consider interesting and valuable for reprinting for the pleasure and benefit of their own readers, and it strangely exemplifies the old adage: many men, many minds.

ST. JOHN OF THE CROSS

You scorned to walk the beaten path,
Where wisdom blossoms by the way,
Preferring one, perfection-built,
Where saints make songs, and poets pray.

Comrade of Christ, the night was dark,
That shed its aura round your tears;
The searing wounds of heart and brain
Throb in the lyrics of your years.

Doubtless in Ubuda the bells
Of your rapt soul were heard by Him—
You clothed in wealth of abstinence,
There as the lamp of time grew dim;

And He, with fellow-traveler's joy,
Lifting your stumbling body up,
Encompassed you with loving eye,
Pressed to your lips the Living Cup.

J. CORSON MILLER

TO A POET LONG SILENT

(To A. K.)

Sing, sing, thou child of song,
Thou hast been mute too long—
Too deep thy mourning;
Behold yon sun on high,
Crystal, unbroken sky
Herald the morning.

Take thy sweet harp in hand,
Touch it with magic wand—
Give us one token:
Greeting another day,
Tell us in thine own way
The spell is broken!

LUDGER WUENSCHL

TWO SONNETS

I

Never think this love I bear is mine:
I have no tool, no fire, no strength or skill
To forge the fickle metal of my will
To passion wrought in such a strong design;
But past my power to welcome or decline
This burning terror, shaped to blind and kill,
Flashed against my soul and struck it still
Save for one dread cry, both human and divine.

Christ is this passion, only the mouth is I;
I am gorged with God; His merciless feet
Have crushed to bitter pulp, drained black and dry,
The grapes of my mind; have threshed and milled my
wheat.

Now in His flesh and blood I live and die:
O take and drink, beloved, take and eat!

II

Calling this love a fancy and absurd,
You speak a truth you neither mean nor guess
And make your scorn hosannas raised to bless
The coming of the Incarnated Word;
Surely, some mad infatuation stirred
In God that He desires your nothingness
And makes of mine a parable to dress
The Spirit none have seen though all have heard.

But you, before the senate of the sane,
Declare a God unseen must be denied;
Use this proof of love to prove love vain:
That I am mocked and scourged and crucified;
And last, you plunge the lance of your disdain
Deep in the Sacred Heart within my side.

FELIX DOHERTY

CHILD WONDERFUL

A child, tender, meek, mild, slender, takes
In arms of love, where charms a million-molded glow,
The Lord who made it; gracing it to grow,
As into adolescent awareness it awakes,
More like that which—around, above, below—
Holds it in the lasting cradle where it lies,
Deep-penetrated, heart-warmed, soul-favored—eyes
Divine divining loveliness when loveliness is low!

Child wonderful, lovely in lowliness, to find
In the haven of all holiness place
To repose! Tumble, planets! Sun, moon, stars, blind,
Plunge far abysmal fathoms from thy face,
While He who holds thee, knows, loves, holding thee
tight,
The unspecked shining mirror of thy light!

ROBERT O'CONNELL

AMBASSADORIAL ADDRESS

*"God is just as careful with the organization of an earth-
worm as the setting up of a nebula. What Wisdom, what
Compassion, what Humor!" Lettre à Mme. X.*

We thank Thee, Domine Sabaoth, for Paul Claudel:
This God-intoxicated sage,
Strayed to us from Thy singing Middle-Age
Suits in this time of turbines very well.
Hell!

And Heaven and Paradise, Thy flower-sown occult places,
This Frankish magian uncovers for us,
Not with a syllogism but with a chorus:
Strange Pythagorean Enna-flowers, sweet baptized
Graces;

French Bernard here is wed to French Watteau
At fair Clairvaux.

Such dear un-Kantian Wisdom, plangent as a bell—
Yea, Lord, accept these thanks for Paul Claudel!

DAVID GORDON

BOOKS

PANORAMA OF THE GOLDEN AGE

AUGUSTUS. THE GOLDEN AGE OF ROME. By G. P. Baker.
Dodd, Mead and Co. \$3.50

TWO thousand years ago this September a child was born to the Roman couple Calus Octavius and Julius Caesar's sister Atia. G. P. Baker hails the bimillennium with a study of this child. The boy was originally named Calus Octavius; Julius Caesar adopted him and the name became Calus Julius Caesar Octavianus. Later the Roman senate and people voted him the title Augustus, in expression of a deep veneration for him. History knows him as Augustus, or more sonorously, Caesar Augustus.

With the days, the deeds, the personality of his grand-uncle, Julius Caesar, this engrossing biography of Augustus gets under way; he was to impose a stamp on all subsequent history. Sacred History knows him in the Gospel. The author vividly shows him at the age of eighteen facing an astonishingly daunting set of circumstances.

Within that life's compass, with all alluring appropriateness of time, come Cicero, consul, senator of lordly Rome, orator, one of the greatest of them, proscribed, marked for death by the Committee of Three; Antony, husband of Fulvia and of Octavia, lover of the serpent of the Nile, rebel, whose influence, even after death, is enormously felt by Augustus; Horace, poet, satirist, sweet singer of a rustic Paradise, who portrays in his pages the Roman people in the days of Augustus; Cleopatra, with her charms, her wealth, Antony's third wife, meeting Augustus, making him conscious of her attractions, but leaving him unmoved by them, at last a suicide at Antony's tomb; Maecenas, Augustus' counselor, sybarite, patron of arts; Virgil, creator of an eclog for Antony, for Augustus of a spacious epic, first poet of the Golden Age as Augustus was its king; Ventidius, Roman General, first establisher of military supremacy over the Parthians; Lepidus, in the Triumvirate with Augustus and Antony, claimant of Sicily; Julia, daughter of Augustus, woman of scandals, exiled by her father; Livy, historian, whom Augustus corrected in regard to literary sources.

So the book had to be interesting, and it is—most entertainingly so. It is not history as science, but history as literature. It recreates a period, a great era, and interprets a great man; it is as colorful as a painting, as alive as drama.

The author's note on Saint Paul's metaphors is of pertinent interest; Catholics, however, believe that Saint Paul was not a pedant user of metaphor when in Galatians, iv, 4-9 he speaks of sons and heirs.

CAROL L. BERNHARDT

GOD AND CIVIL AUTHORITY

RECENT THEORIES OF SOVEREIGNTY. By Hyman Ezra Cohen. University of Chicago Press. \$3

THE AUTHOR of this truly valuable work makes a thorough analysis of recent theories of sovereignty which several outstanding European jurists have taught in the latter part of the nineteenth and in the early decades of the twentieth century. He makes a detailed study of sovereignty as understood by Esmein, Jellinek, Duguit, Kelsen and Laski. Students will be grateful for

this scholarly exposition, analysis and evaluation of the varying viewpoints of these modern jurists. The well-selected bibliography at the end of the work could be improved by adding *The Revival of Natural Law Concepts*, by Charles G. Haines, of the University of California at Los Angeles.

In criticism of the various theories studied one may note briefly that Esmein was to some extent influenced by the ethically unsound political philosophy of Rousseau and that Jellinek was misled by Kant, who illogically denies that the juridical order is a part of the moral order. I say *illogically*, because rights which have their sources in law, like the law itself, appertain to the moral order.

Briefly, too, one notes that Duguit, like Jellinek, goes astray, first, in making law a purely psychological creation, a sum of rules for human conduct with no ethical or religious implications; secondly, in accepting Comte's moral positivism, which denies the intrinsic difference between right and wrong; and finally, in rejecting inalienable rights—such as the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—whose existence the Declaration of Independence declares self-evident. This last error leads logically to the totalitarian state of Hitler and Mussolini and to the Stalin autocracy.

Kelsen's pure jurisprudence is nearer the truth than the preceding theories, but he, too, wrongly defends the positivism of law, namely its independence of morality.

Laski is not a jurist and the theory of political pluralism of this Fabian socialist deserved no consideration. In his view the state has no Divine authority since it is like other collective bodies or mere associations. In *The Rise of Liberalism* (a critical judgment of which was given by the present reviewer in *AMERICA*, October 10, 1936) and in *Democracy in Crisis*, Laski clearly rejects the Divine origin and authority of the state which sovereignty postulates. In *A Grammar of Politics* he says: "The will of government has no special moral claims."

The author's personal views in the final chapter show analytic power but are weakened by his rejection of the old doctrine on Natural Law which (as Taylor, of the University of Michigan, admits in his work *The Law of Nature*) had practically universal acceptance for twenty-two centuries from Plato and Aristotle to Locke and Kant.

HERBERT C. NOONAN

PSYCHOLOGY PSYCHOANALYZED

WHAT MAN HAS MADE OF MAN. By Mortimer J. Adler.
Longmans, Green and Co. \$3.50

PSYCHOANALYST Franz Alexander, of Chicago, sensed that the momentum of laboratory procedure had carried his department beyond the synthesis that should bracket scientific conquest. So he invited "an expert such as Mr. Adler" to lecture on methodology. But Dr. Adler penetrated to more comprehensive truth brackets and laid bare the cause, not only of the centrifugal nemesis of psychoanalysis, but of all the anomalous babel of conflicting psychologies. Psychology is both scientific and philosophical, and a vitiated philosophical component has ruined unity and orientation.

In four lectures Dr. Adler portrays the conception of science in the modern world, the position of psychology, its history and, finally, psychoanalysis as psychology. Owing to the discussions after lectures the author supplemented them with copious notes. Tracing the lineage

THEATRE

of bad philosophizing, he discovers that positivistic piracy has orphaned the study of "man as man" from the fine tradition of Aristotelean and Thomistic thinking. From the beginning to the seventeenth century we find initial errors of Plato corrected by Aristotle. Thence to the nineteenth century atavistic errors regurgitate: Hobbes, Descartes and others reverting to Platonism. Marching to the same tempo, though often on different paths are Kant, Herbart, Brentano. From then till the present, positivistic philosophy has set warped forms for psychology, and, leaving out man's specifying, spiritual soul, has committed the suicide of using the mind in painstaking study to disprove its existence.

Freud is de-pedestaled. His "original" science is found to be looted largely from Plato and others, with an avowed admixture of guessing, though he retains the credit of bringing out the study of the "Repression." What is good is already better stated by Aristotle, and the evolutionary factor Dr. Adler justly brands as a "myth," far beyond factual evidence. Dr. Alexander is shocked, even as Raymond Pearl was dismayed when "the word 'Evolution' does not occur at all" in Carrel's monumental *Man the Unknown*.

Mr. Alexander finds scholasticism "sterile," "futile" and impractical. Were he a mariner he might find stars impractical because you cannot use them for propellers. Adler skilfully shows the value of scholastic philosophy as a guide of practical efforts to ends worth while.

One may be puzzled to hear Dr. Adler say, "The imagination is traditionally called the passive intellect"; that "the mode of being of the separated soul" is "not capable of being solved within . . . philosophy"; that "Providence is not a principle of philosophy." Undoubtedly he can explain. But even if he did not, these would be but spots on a sun. And though the matter is concentrated, adapted rather for the initiate; though it is distracting to turn from text to notes and back again, the work is particularly marked by a solidity blended with brilliance.

The book throughout is constructive, demonstrating that psychoanalysis will best rid itself of *insolubilia* by shifting its factual labors onto the security of the true philosophy. Dr. Adler "has no doubt that philosophy will reach a new fruition, healing thereby the disharmonies and blemishes of modern times." His own acumen and horizon of realizations, his facility and academic integrity should equip him to "prophecy unto these bones" of a dismembered, soulless psychology. Are we looking possibly for an American Maritain?

MARK GAFFNEY

CATHOLIC LITURGY. By Rev. Gaspar Lefebvre, O.S.B.
B. Herder Book Co. \$2.25

THIS volume is a new impression of a liturgical manual, the first English edition of which appeared in 1924. It treats of the liturgy and its fundamental principles, and in it the faithful will find opened to them a practical understanding of the official worship of the Church. The book has had universal appeal, having seen the light of day in seven different languages. It was written to explain the principles which must guide the liturgical apostolate.

THE ROAD OF PAIN. By Rev. Hugh F. Blunt. Joseph F. Wagner, Inc. \$1.50

BOOKS of all sorts, differing in treatment of course, have come off the press about the Passion of Our Divine Lord. But Christians never tire of hearing about the sufferings of Christ on the road to Calvary, for they realize that all was done for their redemption. Father Blunt in this present volume on the Way of the Cross combines with erudition and orthodoxy that measure of piety which will satisfy those whose feeling as well as thought is Catholic. It differs somewhat in design from others dealing with the same sacred subject, for it does not consist merely of a group of pious prayers to be said at each station, but with deep feeling and insight gives the authoritative story in detail of Christ's last days on earth.

THESE are sad, sad nights at the Broadhurst and the Guild Theatre. One enters these pleasure palaces more or less carefree and happy in search of diversion. One is touchingly optimistic about finding it. If one cannot find diversion in the theatre where is it these days? Sustained by this reflection, one sinks into one's seat—and, simultaneously with the characters on the stage—also sinks into depression and despair.

MADAME BOVARY. In *Madame Bovary*, the Theatre Guild's third production of the season, put on at the Broadhurst, one watches a lady go to her doom in sixteen scenes, each scene a bit more harrowing than the preceding. A new version of this ancient French classic, done by a certain Gaston Baty, has recently been successful in Paris. Reason enough for bringing it over to us? One cannot feel that it is, even with Constance Cummings looking very lovely in the earlier scenes, committing suicide with considerable abandon in the final one, and presenting admirably the long-drawn agonies in between. She has some lovely frocks, and wears them with an air, and in the last scene of all she falls dead with a crash that brings the hearts of sympathetic spectators into their mouths. In short—and do not imagine that her art is not appreciated—Miss Cummings does all a gifted actress could do to give life to the tale.

But *Madame Bovary* is not even well written, and it is presented in a series of little dramatic spasms which become more and more depressing as one follows them to the final convulsion. What is the use of good acting, good direction, and a star that is really luminous, when the vehicle to be acted was still-born?

THE GHOST OF YANKEE DOODLE. Partly, perhaps, to make us forget *Madame Bovary*, the Theatre Guild promptly gave us its fourth production, Sidney Howard's *Ghost of Yankee Doodle*. Having had six nights to get over the effects of *Madame Bovary*, the intrepid band of Guild subscribers optimistically presented themselves for the new offering—and got what was coming to them.

What was and is coming, according to Mr. Howard is the collapse of civilization. It is true that at the end Ethel Barrymore began to express a faint hope that "some day"—but she choked over the words, as any one would do after the seven scenes of *Yankee Doodle*.

Mr. Howard had attempted to show us what will happen to us during the next World War. He ended by making us listen to more talk than any audience anywhere could digest. We Guild subscribers are quite intelligent. But we freely admitted to one another that we did not know what all the talk was about. Neither did the Theatre Guild know nor did the company. Least of all, I fancy, did Mr. Howard, whose words came forth like machine gun bullets, aimed only at time and space. Few of those words, except Ethel Barrymore's, hit us. We all enjoyed looking at her, and seeing her again on the stage, and hearing her lovely voice and her beautiful enunciation. We knew that if she had been given any acting to do she could have done it. That was about the only conviction I carried away from the Guild Theatre on the opening night of *The Ghost of Yankee Doodle*.

OBITUARIES. We have half a dozen good new plays in town, with *Father Malachy's Miracle* at the head of list. We have had also a large number of sudden cases of dramatic heart failure. Among the recent victims were: *Too Many Heroes*; *Places, Please*; *Young Mr. Disraeli*; *The Bough Breaks*; *Antony and Cleopatra* (even Tallulah Bankhead could not save *Cleopatra* this time); *Robins' Landing*. *Too Many Heroes* had merit, and may have been buried alive.

ELIZABETH JORDAN

ART

ALTHOUGH I mentioned some weeks ago the exhibition of paintings by French Canadians, which is being held at the East River Galleries and which will have closed by the time this column appears in print, I cannot help indulging in the very human failing of doing a little crowing. Over a year ago the work of these French Canadians—none of them trained or professional artists and all of them simple people who earn their livings at the normal occupations of a rural community—was called to the attention of the readers of this column. The occasion was an exhibition held in Murray Bay in the Province of Quebec.

As was announced some weeks ago, representative work of these folk artists has now been shown in New York, and every critic of major importance has hailed them as a fresh and exciting group of artists. Out of about fifty paintings shown, twenty-three have been sold to date, and in spite of the inaccessibility of the galleries where the pictures have been on exhibition, they have attracted wide public attention. So the readers of AMERICA can feel that comfortable superiority which arises from having known all about something before it became fashionable.

At the Valentine Galleries is a retrospective showing of the paintings of John Kane. One cannot help making comparisons with the French Canadian paintings mentioned above, since Kane also was a self-taught folk artist. The only difference is that Kane has had some years of publicity so that his pictures are priced at what seem to me incredibly high figures. His paintings—largely landscapes in industrial Pennsylvania—have the charm of genuine naïveté, but they seem to me to lack any vestige of feeling. They are a careful record of what a good Scotch workingman saw, rendered as well as he was able. And this, after all, is only the beginning of artistic expression.

The New York newspapers and some of the illustrated magazines have been calling attention during the last few weeks to a painting by Peter Blume entitled *The Eternal City* which has been on exhibition at the Julien Levy Gallery in New York and which will presumably be seen on numerous occasions throughout the country. This painting has occupied most of the artist's time during the last three years, and it is certainly an extraordinary achievement. But I do not by any means recommend to Catholics who are at all easily shocked that they go out of their way to see what Mr. Blume has done. It requires considerable self-control to examine this painting without losing one's temper, and one has to forget that one is Catholic if one is to appreciate what artistic merit his work has.

In subject matter the painting is an amazingly confused attack upon Fascism and Christianity. In the foreground a livid green head of Mussolini attached to a paper-covered spring, as though it were a jack-in-the-box, leers across some broken fragments of classical antiquity toward a shrine which contains a repulsive representation of Our Lord. The surrounding foreground depicts the ruins of the passageways under the Coliseum. In the middleground a procession of proletarians is breaking out of these subterranean passages into the ruins of a Roman forum where their leaders are persuading the enlisted troops of an army to mutiny against their officers. In the background are a succession of hillsides with Italian villages and in the extreme distance are rugged mountains and a sunset sky. To the right one catches a glimpse of a monastery cloister with two Franciscans running away from the scene on the forum.

It is almost impossible to discover precisely what the painter intends as a "programme" or allegory for his painting. One feels the need of a written explanation. The figure of Our Lord, for instance, is made repulsive

by the fact that it is surrounded with a collection of objects such as one would only find in a pawnshop. These include swords, a cane, several gold watches, some gold hearts, a pair of opera glasses, several old military medals and a large assortment of epaulets. On the Saviour's fingers there must be at least a dozen rings of various kinds and upon his wrists and hands lie bracelets. Around his neck is a very ornate gold pectoral cross. He sits upon a seat designed exactly like a bishop's faldstool, and at his feet are a cracked wooden poor-box and a vase of partly wilted flowers.

All of these objects (excepting the last two) and the figure of Our Lord are in a deep niche, which is brightly illuminated within, but the entrance to which is surrounded with dark shadows. To the left of this niche kneel two figures, one of a priest and the other of a middle-class woman. In front of the niche sits a horribly deformed old beggar woman who is telling her beads, and in front of her there is a black cocker spaniel engaged in sniffing among the classical fragments. The figure of Our Lord, if it were not surrounded with all these articles of doubtful virtue, would not be objectionable. It merely represents Him as the Man of Sorrows—a familiar enough figure throughout the history of Christian art. It is the introduction of the trinkets which makes the whole thing as blasphemous as anything I have ever seen.

The only interpretation which I can conceive of this extraordinary performance is that it is an attempt to set forth pictorially the old romantic and sentimental thesis that Christ is in Himself altogether admirable, but that everything that He taught has been perverted by an oppressing and rapacious Church. Perhaps Mr. Blume had some other deep notion in mind. Whatever he did have in mind, it is perfectly obvious that he hates Christianity as it at present exists. The representation of Mussolini as a jack-in-the-box, I assume, is that Mr. Blume considers Mussolini a mere figure-head for the forces of greed and violence. And I further assume that the scene in the middle background of the proletariat victorious over its oppressors represents the glorious result of an anti-capitalistic and anti-Christian revolution.

The reader may well ask why I give so much attention to a picture which obviously, from its very description alone, is one which must be shocking to any Catholic. My reason is that Mr. Blume has great technical adroitness in his painting, and adroitness of a sort which will make the painting appealing to a vast majority of people. It contains much which, from a purely technical point of view, is in extremely bad taste, to put it mildly. The distant view of mountains and sky is of about the same artistic quality as a middle nineteenth-century chromolithograph of the most debased variety. And yet his skill as a draughtsman is so great, his color so vivid and his disposition of objects so skilfully ordered that even sophisticated critics have given and will continue to give complete artistic approval to what he has done. I venture to prophesy that *The Eternal City* will be called to the attention of the American public again and again during the next few years, and I feel strongly that Catholics should understand that here is a very second-rate piece of art—however technically able—as well as a technically naïve piece of propaganda. But I am sure that the most effective attack upon it is to say, what is undoubtedly true, that the painting itself is a work of very little consequence artistically and of no consequence intellectually. Merely to become angered at what Mr. Blume has seen fit to devote the last three years of his life to producing is to confirm others in the belief that Mr. Blume has produced a masterpiece both of art and of effective thinking. HARRY LOREN BINSSE

FILMS

THE LAST GANGSTER. Edward G. Robinson returns to his underworld characterizations in grim earnest in this carefully constructed melodrama. The film is notably lacking in the garish romanticism which marked earlier glorification of the gunman; it swings, as a matter of fact, toward an extreme of sordidness and brutality which will certainly not attract the gentler moviegoer. It is the story of a gangster who leaves Alcatraz with the intention of killing his former wife, who has remarried during his imprisonment. His son, however, is kidnapped by his rivals to force him to surrender a cache of money. In the struggle which follows, he relents toward his wife but is shot down by the hijackers. Director Edward Ludwig has conceived a kind of case history, showing the emergence and development, rise and fall of a man who readily typifies the American gangster. Mr. Robinson's performance makes the moral concrete and effective. James Stewart, Rose Stradner and John Carradine are noteworthy in the cast. The production is forceful at times but more often merely harsh and unpleasant, colored by a strong revenge motif. However, if, as the title suggests, this is a gangster film to end all gangster films, one can be grateful enough to approve it for the sterner adults. (MGM)

BEG, BORROW OR STEAL. The Riviera provides a pretentious background for this slight comedy. It is an exposé of an amiable Continental confidence man, not exactly rich in humorous incident but consistently entertaining. A dealer in bogus art treasures, living on the Mediterranean and his wits, invites his wife in America to stage their daughter's approaching wedding at his chateau. When she calls his bluff, he is forced to borrow a house and bestow hasty titles on his friends. All goes reasonably well until his daughter's unhappiness over the match leads him to confess his fraud. The unwelcome fiancé departs in horror, leaving the field clear for true love and a genuine count. Frank Morgan lends all his comedy manners to the well-intentioned but weak parent. John Beal and Florence Rice manage the romance under the eye of Janet Beecher. The picture is recommended as wholesome amusement for the family. (MGM)

MR. BOGGS STEPS OUT. Working hard on the formula which served Clarence Buddington Kelland's *Mr. Deeds* so handsomely, this average film, based on a story by the same author, attains none of the delirious high-spots of that trailblazer. The humor is spread so thinly over so much footage that it arouses no more than an occasional chuckle. An unimaginative office fixture wins a bean-guessing contest and invests his prize money in a failing barrel factory. A collapsible barrel is invented to stave off disaster but is put into use only after a sales campaign resembling an obstacle race. All ends well for the factory, the dependent townspeople and the owner's romance. Stuart Erwin makes a brave attempt to enliven a script which is long and lustreless. The picture may prove diverting enough for minor family entertainment. (Grand National)

BORROWING TROUBLE. That American institution, the Jones family, needs no recommendation to an amused public. Of all the inexpensive comedies destined for double-feature showings, these domestic sagas are the most dependable for fun and good taste. The newest threat to the Jones' happy home is a young truant who takes up residence there in order to mend his ways. The subsequent complications are almost too much even for a model home. Jed Prouty, Spring Byington, Shirley Deane and Russell Gleason prove a family is not necessarily a commonwealth of malignants. (Twentieth Century-Fox)

THOMAS J. FITZMORRIS

EVENTS

AFTER weary centuries of search, mankind has at long last found the golden path to peace. The discovery has been made by the professors. Now it can be told. Everything that makes life worthwhile, including peace, depends on glands. Glandocracy will preserve democracy. It will increase the amount of mother love in the world. It will put an end to war. Nations will hand in their submarines and dreadnoughts to the curio shops. Glandocracy means peace on earth to men of good will and men of bad will. . . . The glands send out internal secretions to all parts of an individual's body. These internal secretions, or glandocrats, determine everything. If a person hates another person, some gland is out of order. If class wars on class, the presumption is neither class is hitting on all glands. If a nation makes ugly faces at another nation—well, you know what causes that. It's glands. . . . Thus far the professors have worked chiefly on rats. They (the professors not the rats) do not see any basic difference between men and rats. . . . What do you think causes mother love? You know, of course. It's the pituitary gland. . . . Now try this little experiment. Secure secretions from the pituitary gland from some professor, and shoot the secretions or glandocrats into a virgin rat, one you have noticed never mothered other rats running around your home. Then purchase three or four dozen rat traps, and catch all the rats in your house or apartment. You will be amazed to perceive the virgin rat mother all the rats in your domicile. . . . To the professors, this experiment proves that mother love is a glandular function which can be turned on or off at will. The professors do not see any essential difference between the lofty spiritual mother love of a good woman and the mothering instincts of a rat. . . . And just as mother love can be switched on, so can other things. Inject the right glandocrats and you transform hate into love. . . . Soon the newspapers may be carrying amazing tales, tales we would not believe before the glandocracy era set in. . . .

January 3, 19—Berlin. The conference between English and German diplomats, all stuffed with glandocrats, struck a snag. The British, feeling that Germany was one of the "have-not" group, begged the Reich to take possession of India, South Africa, the United States, the Suez Canal, Australia, Canada, New Zealand. Sir Harry Cholmondeley-Bracket-Brackett Leslie led the British delegation. Count Pfeisterweg Schespfeim-Wuerszog-flammer, chief of the Reich group, said Germany could never consent to partition of the British Empire. All England was in gloom tonight when the bad news reached London.

Jan. 4, 19—Czechoslovakia definitely and finally rejected the German offer of January 1. Because of the friendly feeling existing between Prague and Berlin, the Reich Government as a Christmas gift, insisted on ceding to Czechoslovakia, Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, the Rhineland. Prague's reply, though couched in diplomatic language, rejected the offer. Prague could not thus impose on German generosity, the message said.

Jan. 8, 19—French efforts to give away Alsace-Lorraine and her African colonial possession have thus far been rebuffed.

Jan. 10, 19—A pro-Japanese campaign was launched throughout China yesterday. Cheering throngs shouted huzzas at the Tokyoans for relieving them of so much territory.

Jan. 12, 19—Herbert Hoover arrived at the White House yesterday, following the urgent invitation of President Roosevelt. He will spend a week with the Roosevelts, following which Mr. Roosevelt, Hoover, Al Smith, Jim Reed will go fishing, together.

Jan. 18, 19—John L. Lewis and William Green left yesterday on a duck hunting trip.

THE PARADER